Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-096
Friday
17 May 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-096 *17 May 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: On 6 May 1991, the DAILY REPORT will begin phasing in new radio and television sourcelines that reflect how a station identifies itself. This change eliminates the "Domestic Service" and "Television Service" designations in favor of the station identification as broadcast. The presence of a new sourceline reflects this change in policy, rather than the establishment of a new station or network.

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Prospects for Limiting Tactical Arms Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 May]* 1
Military Talks Could Pave Way for Summit *[IZVESTIYA 15 May]* 2
Bush Chemical Weapons Policy: 'Major Progress' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 May]* 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Churkin Views PRC Talks, Angola, Other Issues *[TASS]* 5
'Contradictory Rumors' on Gorbachev, G-7 Summit *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 17 May]* 5
Shcherbakov, Primakov To Attend G-7 Meeting *[Hamburg DPA]* 5
World Health Assembly on Chernobyl Aid *[TASS]* 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Soviet GRU Chief Cited on Alleged Defector *[IZVESTIYA 17 May]* 6

China

Jiang Zemin Visit Enters Second Day 6
TASS Reports Talks' 2d Round 6
Jiang Zemin Meets Pavlov *[PRAVDA 17 May]* 7
Jiang Zemin Meets Lukyanov *[TASS]* 7
TASS Reports Border Agreement 7
Jiang Zemin Meets Friendship Group *[PRAVDA 16 May]* 8
Communique on Talks Issued *[TASS]* 8
PRC Spokesman Cited on Talks *[TASS]* 8

Northeast Asia

Visiting ROK House Leader Interviewed in Moscow *[Moscow International]* 9
Japanese View of Soviet 'Threat' Noted *[TASS]* 11
Commentary on Okinawa Reversion Anniversary *[Moscow International]* 12
Troops Said Leaving Islands Off Hokkaido *[Tokyo KYODO]* 12
Defense Ministry Denies Cuts *[PRAVDA 17 May]* 13

East Europe

Slovene Delegation Arrives in Moscow for Talks *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 13
Prime Minister Meets Bulgarian Counterpart *[TASS]* 13
Popov Pre-Visit Interview *[IZVESTIYA 17 May]* 13
Poland Soviet Troop Withdrawal Talks Continue *[Warsaw PAP]* 14

West Europe

Gorbachev's Possible UK Visit Viewed *[INTERFAX]* 14
Ignatenko on Decision on Fate of Honecker *[Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG 15 May]* 14

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

USSR Supreme Soviet 16 May Session Reported *[Moscow TV]* 15
Law on State Security Bodies Adopted *[TASS]* 15
KGB Chief Welcomes New State Security Law *[TASS]* 16
Supreme Soviet Fails To Pass Emigration Bill *[TASS]* 16
Supreme Soviet Rejects Gorbachev Appointee *[Moscow Radio]* 17
Orlov Appointed Head of Control Chamber *[TASS]* 17

Political & Social

Further on Shcherbakov Cabinet Address *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 16 May]* 18
Pavlov, Shcherbakov Hold News Conference *[Moscow TV]* 18
Pavlov Backs Ryzhkov for RSFSR Presidency *[TASS]* 22
Gorbachev Decree To Ensure Stability in Sectors *[TASS]* 23
Text of Decree *[PRAVDA 17 May]* 23
Trade Union Leader Rejects Decree *[TASS]* 24
Gorbachev Submits Ministerial Candidates *[INTERFAX]* 25
Ignatenko Denies Rumors on Gorbachev House *[TASS]* 25
Civil Flight Personnel To Join Strike *[Moscow TV]* 25
Planned Air Controller Strike Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 25
Supreme Soviet Passes Law on KGB *[INTERFAX]* 25
Politburo's Semenova Holds News Conference *[PRAVDA 16 May]* 26
Kalugin U.S. Newspaper Interview Appraised *[TRUD 14 May]* 26
TASS Reviews Press for 17 May 26

Economic

Gosbank To Introduce New Ruble Banknotes *[TASS]* 27
Republics Demand Information on Foreign Debt *[INTERFAX]* 27
Officials Agree on Anticrisis Economic Measures *[INTERFAX]* 28
Structure for Market Transition Discussed *[PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK No 16]* 28

Agriculture

PRAVDA Notes Decline in Food Production *[14 May]* 29

Scientific

Cosmos Satellites Launched by Tsiklon Rocket *[TASS]* 30
Soyuz Launch Announced for 18 May *[Moscow International]* 30
Gorbachev Greets Forum of Space Agencies *[TASS]* 31
Soviet-West European Space Conference Ends *[TASS]* 31

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Baltic Republics Refuse To Fund Soviet Budget *[INTERFAX]* 32
Baltic Foreign Ministers View Foreign Policies *[EKHO LITVY 3 May]* 32
Latvia Seeks Independence by Year's End *[Moscow Radio]* 32
Latvia Discusses Soviet Troop Withdrawal *[BALTFAX]* 32
Financial War Between USSR, Latvia Continues *[BALTFAX]* 33
Workers Plan 23 May Protest Rally in Riga *[BALTFAX]* 33

Lithuanian Moderates Seek New Ties With Union *[TASS]* 33
Lithuania's Butkevicius Warns of Military Action *[Radio Vilnius]* 34
Lithuania Says Moscow Playing 'Polish Card' *[Radio Vilnius]* 34
Lithuania-Soviet Army Tensions 'Increasing' *[Hamburg DPA]* 34
Lithuanian Customs Checkpoint Attacked 15 May *[BALTFAX]* 35
Official 'Alarmed' by Attacks *[BALTFAX]* 35
Attacks Continue 16 May *[Vilnius Radio]* 35
Lithuania's Brazauskas on Economic Situation *[EKHO LITVY 4 May]* 35
Lithuanian Recession in Food, Housing Continues *[PRAVDA 16 May]* 37
Lithuanian Official on Border Incidents *[BALTFAX]* 37
Landsbergis Bodyguard Allegedly Linked to Death *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 May]* 37

RSFSR

Commentary, Reportage on Yeltsin's CSFR Visit 38
Visit Seen as 'Breakthrough' *[IZVESTIYA 16 May]* 38
Supreme Soviet Briefed on Trip *[TASS]* 38
Measures To Stabilize Economy Cited *[TASS]* 39
Correspondent Reviews Visit *[Moscow Radio]* 39
Visit Hailed *[INTERFAX]* 39
Visit Termed 'Very Good' *[IZVESTIYA 15 May]* 40
PRAVDA Discusses Visit *[15 May]* 40
Reportage on Supreme Soviet Sessions 41
Food Sales Tax Abolished *[TASS]* 41
Two Laws Adopted *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Constitutional Changes Adopted *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Silayev Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 41
Ryzhkov Addresses Lipetsk Workers on Elections *[Moscow TV]* 42
TASS Analyzes Support for Russian Candidates 42
Funding for Presidential Campaign Detailed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 May]* 43
RSFSR Presidential Campaign 'Unpredictable' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 May]* 43
Official Urges Preparations for Privatization *[INTERFAX]* 44
'Democratic Russia' Criticizes Military Action *[INTERFAX]* 44
Explosion at Democratic Russian Headquarters *[TASS]* 44
Yeltsin Opponent States Positions *[Radio Rossii]* 44

Western Republics

Moldova People's Front Independence Plan Fails *[TASS]* 47
Moldovan Prime Minister Said Asked To Resign *[INTERFAX]* 47
Moldovan President Announces Anti-Crisis Program *[INTERFAX]* 47
'Fiery' Disruption of Khmara's Trial Reported *[PRAVDA 16 May]* 48
Ukraine Legislature Debates Draft Constitution *[INTERFAX]* 48
Belorussian Legislature May Face Strikes *[INTERFAX]* 49
Three Economic Roads for Belorussia Suggested *[INTERFAX]* 49

Caucasus

Georgian Candidate's Headquarters Seized *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 May]* 49
Georgian People's Front Protest to RSFSR *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 23 Apr]* 50
Resolution on Georgian Presidential Elections *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 25 Apr]* 52
Georgia Protests Restoration of South Ossetia *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 9 May]* 52
Fourteen Injured in South Ossetia Shooting *[Radio Rossii]* 53
Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan, KGB's Kryuchkov Meet *[Moscow TV]* 53
'Democratic Russia' on Ending Force in Armenia *[INTERFAX]* 53
Armenian Premier on Turning From Brink of Abyss *[Yerevan International]* 53
Lukyanov Describes Situation in Nagorno-Karabakh *[TASS]* 54
Nagorno-Karabakh Appeals for UN Assistance *[TASS]* 54
NKAO Leaders Appeal to UN, World Legislatures *[INTERFAX]* 54
Mounting Tensions in Nagorno-Karabakh Cited *[INTERFAX]* 54
Troop Massing, Hostage Taking Reported in NKAO *[ARMENPRES]* 55

Central Asia

Niyazov on Union Treaty, Turkmen Economy *[IZVESTIYA 16 May]* 55
Tajik President on Joint Statement, Union Treaty *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 May]* 57
New Kyrgyz Party Leader Supports Gorbachev *[Moscow TV]* 59
Tajik Law on Denationalization *[cross-reference]* 60
Uzbek Draft Legislation on Enterprises *[cross-reference]* 60
Uzbek Law on Banks, Banking Activities *[cross-reference]* 60
Uzbek Law on Income Tax *[cross-reference]* 60
Kazakh Law on Employment of Population *[cross-reference]* 60
Kyrgyz Illegal Trade Activities Amendments *[cross-reference]* 60

Prospects for Limiting Tactical Arms Viewed

PM1705085091 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 May 91 First Edition p 5

["Problems and Opinions" article by Candidate of Military Sciences Lieutenant General A. Politsyn: "Can Europe Be Rid of Nuclear Weapons?"]

[Text] The transition in international politics from confrontation between East and West to mutual understanding and cooperation is a fact. The process of eliminating the remnants of the "cold war" is under way. Trust and partnership are becoming the increasingly strong foundation of relations between states. Still, the weight of the past is manifestly putting the brakes on movement ahead. The military-political leadership of the United States and its allies upholds the need for NATO to keep its military organization. The desire to achieve military superiority over the USSR by developing new types of high-accuracy arms, whose combat capabilities are close to those of weapons of mass destruction, is causing concern.

The question of tactical nuclear weapons on the European continent stands out in particularly sharp relief. These weapons not only possess considerable destructive power, they are also less easily verifiable because they can be used in "dual purpose" systems and can be employed in a surprise first strike, which makes it difficult for the opposite side to take appropriate countermeasures. The Soviet side has, on more than one occasion, proposed the elimination of tactical nuclear weapons, stressing that the preservation, modernization, and buildup of tactical nuclear systems will have an increasingly destabilizing effect on the military-political situation in Europe and could cause an unsanctioned nuclear conflict with all the ensuing dire consequences.

On the basis of its position of principle, the Soviet Union favors an immediate start to talks on this problem. The subject of the talks should be ground-based tactical missile systems and their nuclear charges, nuclear artillery shells, nuclear landmines, nuclear-capable aircraft, and airborne nuclear munitions. In our opinion, those attending the talks might include the USSR, the United States, Great Britain, France, and also those European states on whose territory these weapons are sited and where the means for delivering them exist. At all stages of the talks, the maintenance of stability in the European zone could be guaranteed by commitments taken by the sides not to increase the number of ground-based and airborne tactical nuclear weapons above agreed levels within the confines of the continent. At the first stage of cuts (two to three years) the region affected could be Central Europe; at the second stage (three years) it could be an extended Central European zone; at the third stage (three to five years) it could be a European zone from the Atlantic to the Urals.

For a long time the NATO countries did not want to raise the tactical nuclear weapons problem and delayed the start of talks using all manner of pretexts. Today even in NATO they are starting to look at the possibility of sitting down for talks on this problem.

Washington and London believe that the talks should not lead to the total elimination of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, that a certain minimum level of weapons should be preserved. The United States and the USSR should be the principal partners at the talks. The subject of the talks could include nuclear weapons alone (shells, airborne bombs, and missile warheads) and should not extend to "dual purpose" delivery systems. It is proposed that the tactical nuclear weapons subject to cuts could be withdrawn for storage on U.S. territory or dismantled to extract the nuclear components. The talks should exclude the "zero option" in respect of any tactical nuclear weapon component so as not to establish conditions for British and French linkage to the talks and the limitation of their nuclear arsenals.

At the present time, Washington's military experts have not formulated a united opinion regarding the zone specified in the talks. The majority of them are proposing to limit the area of application of the future agreement to an "extended Central European" zone, as it is defined in the CFE Treaty. American experts are proposing that the military subunits responsible for storing and protecting tactical nuclear munitions on European territory should be the subject of control [obyekt kontrolya].

Great Britain's attitude to the tactical nuclear weapons talks is based on its own understanding of the "nuclear deterrence" idea. In London's opinion, strategic nuclear forces should not remain the only system fulfilling the deterrent function on the "macrolevel"—between the USSR, the United States, Great Britain, France, and China. Deterrence is needed on the "microlevel," bearing in mind the possibility of nuclear weapons appearing in "Third World" countries. Efforts at the talks should be concentrated on systems that have declining military significance (nuclear artillery and ground-based tactical missiles).

France, while favoring talks between the USSR and the United States, would not, however, be in favor of talks which in any way affected its own nuclear arsenal. At the same time, the French would not refuse to participate in discussing problems linked to the nuclear presence of the two superpowers in Europe.

On the whole, this group of countries (the United States, Great Britain, and France) occupies a common position: They do not want deep cuts in tactical nuclear weapons and are striving for systematic modernization of these weapons. In their opinion, the total destruction of tactical nuclear systems is inadmissible, since this could provoke a number of undesirable results:

—the disruption of NATO unity, which could lead to the decreased possibility of exerting political pressure on the USSR;

—the curtailment of the U.S. military presence in Europe, a lesser role for the military factor in politics, and the appearance of friction in relations between allies in the bloc;

—the gradual "slipping away" of a number of Western European states (in particular the FRG) toward a "neutral" policy;

—the revision of the "flexible response" idea and the appearance of additional difficulties for NATO.

The leading circles of another group of NATO countries—the FRG, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, and Greece—have positively welcomed the USSR's proposal and have taken up a more radical position. They favor the elimination of nuclear weapons and an extension of the circle of participants at the talks, which would include not just the nuclear powers but also countries where nuclear weapons are sited. In their opinion, at the first stage, tactical nuclear systems, including "dual purpose" systems, need to be cut to a level which makes the task of averting war possible, and at the second stage they can proceed to total elimination. Modernizing tactical nuclear weapons is inadvisable—this can only prolong the talks.

Generally speaking, the NATO countries' tactical nuclear weapons modernization program in Europe, which was worked out as early as 1977-1978, is a topic of constant debate. It now includes two elements: equipping tactical aircraft with a new missile with a range of about 500 km, designed as a replacement for airborne nuclear bombs, and the adoption of a new "surface-to-surface" missile with a range of about 500 km to replace the "Lance" missile. The second element of the program, however, is opposed by the majority of European countries, which has forced the NATO leadership to postpone the replacement of the "Lance" missiles until 1992.

At the same time, France is completing preparation for the adoption of the new "Hades" missile with a range of 350-500 km, to replace the "Pluton" missile. An increase in the number of launchers from 36 to 90, and according to some sources as many as 180, is expected for the new missiles. Furthermore, since 1986 the French have been equipping their tactical aircraft with ASMP nuclear missiles with a range of about 300 km.

A joint Anglo-American decision was made at the beginning of this year to modernize nuclear systems. It is noteworthy that the implementation of this plan is camouflaged in an overall package of measures to change the U.S. military presence in Great Britain, which includes the withdrawal, starting in 1992, of the 14th U.S. Navy nuclear submarine [SSBN] squadron from the Holy Loch base, and the replacement of the F-111 fighter-bombers with modernized F-15E aircraft. A squadron of U.S. multipurpose nuclear submarines, each carrying 12 "Tomahawk" cruise missiles, the nuclear version of which has a range of about 2,600 km (a range of over 4,000 km is projected for the future) could be stationed at the Holy Loch base.

For the F-15E aircraft, it is planned to site about 130 missiles in Great Britain, which are being developed in accordance with the tactical air-to-surface missile program. It is also planned to equip "Tornado" and F-16 aircraft with these missiles. Arming the tactical air force with nuclear missiles will significantly increase its capabilities of overcoming air defense and striking at installations deep in enemy territory. Basically, the new aircraft and the "Tomahawk" sea-launched cruise missile are operational systems, and this testifies not only to the desire to implement a tactical nuclear weapons modernization program, but also to a dangerous attempt to increase the strike power of nuclear systems in Europe, getting around the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

The planned siting in Europe of new nuclear weapons systems that are expected to operate in the 21st century creates serious political and psychological difficulties for the tactical nuclear weapons talks, and drags European countries into a new spiral of the arms race.

The constructive resolution of the tactical nuclear weapons problem that the Soviet side is proposing is meant to promote the achievement of genuine security on the European continent and will enable us to rely not on nuclear arsenals in international relations, but on political methods. Europe does not want nuclear weapons. Even without these it is saturated with highly dangerous military, chemical, and biological installations.

Military Talks Could Pave Way for Summit

PM1605133991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[Correspondent V. Nadein report: "Good Week Expected. Concord Between M. Gorbachev and B. Yeltsin Resulting in Improved Soviet-U.S. Relations"]

[Text] Washington—Commenting on the recent 45-minute telephone conversation between Soviet President M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President G. Bush, White House Press Spokesman B. Harlow said: "Both leaders agreed that the state of U.S.-Soviet relations remains good."

This week could bring with it a number of other major achievements in this important area of the global political process.

The arrival in Washington of a Soviet military delegation headed by Chief of the General Staff M. Moiseyev and the visit to Moscow of a high-ranking economic delegation headed by R. Crowder, U.S. under secretary for agriculture, promise breakthroughs in areas that only recently seemed dead ends.

To this should be added the simultaneous presence in the Near East of USSR Foreign Minister A. Bessmertnykh and Secretary of State J. Baker. Owing to their high periodicity, the meetings between the leaders of the two countries' foreign departments have lost their flavor of sensationalism. The activities of these ministers, although not formally coordinated, are inspired by mutually shared ideas of peace in that region—which sharply increases the chances of success in resolving the world's most chronic conflict.

Many commentators link the obvious progress in Soviet-U.S. relations with the well-known statement of the "nine plus one," with the fact that the attack on M.S. Gorbachev by champions of a tough line at the Central Committee plenum misfired, and, in particular, with the first clear signs of the mutual understanding which is being manifested increasingly clearly in relations between the leaders of the Union and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic.

"In exchange for a compromise from Gorbachev, Yeltsin, the populist who wields tremendous power over the country's millions of exasperated workers, managed to settle the Soviet miners' strike which had been threatening the already disintegrating economy with total collapse," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes.

U.S. mass media consider the question which our military men headed by General M. Moiseyev have to resolve to be the most difficult but key aspect of further development.

It is a question of transferring several Soviet combined units from the ground forces to the jurisdiction of the marines. The Americans maintain that such an action runs counter to the spirit of the Paris Agreement because it conceals from destruction the agreed numbers of tanks, artillery, etc. The Soviet side adheres to the letter of the treaty, which does not extend in any way to the marines. In their telephone conversation the leaders of the two states reportedly reached a conclusion on the need to seek a mutually acceptable solution to this problem.

Although the unhealthy arrogance characteristic of the mores of the Cold War period no longer dictates the sides' line of conduct, it will, nonetheless, be difficult to achieve this "mutual acceptability." To all appearances, our partners will still insist unequivocally on the adoption, essentially, of their own viewpoint.

In holding these talks, Gen. M. Moiseyev will clearly sense the extent to which important economic agreements depend on his flexibility, including the question of granting credits to the tune of $1.5 billion to buy food in the United States. Although no direct linkage between the two problems has been officially announced, the U.S. press is increasingly frequently calling the upcoming summit meeting a "strategic treaty summit."

The President has not yet expressed a clear stand on the Moscow meeting of the two heads of state. The viewpoint that the Kremlin needs the summit far more than the White House does predominate in Washington.

This is why Defense Secretary R. Cheney and National Security Adviser B. Scowcroft are recommending that the President abstain from the meeting. The fact that the treaty on strategic offensive arms is not ready can be advanced as the reason; so—as a pretext—can the lack of reliable communications resulting from the 28 March fire in the U.S. Embassy building in Moscow.

As distinct from this, U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker considers pauses in relations potentially dangerous.

If the military men find a way next week to settle the conflict regarding the Marines, scope will at once be opened up in bilateral relations for movement in several important areas.

First, it will at once become obvious that the differences over the text of the treaty on offensive arms are nothing more than technical details that have been fully resolved by politicians and need only expert agreement.

Second, in the atmosphere of the approaching summit it will be easier to realize the convincing arguments of many politicians, businessmen, and mass media in favor of the quickest granting of the $1.5-billion loan being requested by the Soviet Union.

Third, doors could open for the Soviet Union's participation in the conference of the "big seven"—the seven major Western powers—which will be held in London and is scheduled for July. THE WASHINGTON POST believes that it cannot be ruled out that the Moscow meeting of the two presidents could, for various reasons, turn into a London meeting.

A number of newspapers and broadcasts express the administration's wishes to leave no doubt that aid can only be granted on condition of the development of democratic processes in the Soviet Union. At the same time the U.S. press believes that the fulfillment of the entire package of agreements of the "nine plus one," which includes (I cite THE WASHINGTON POST) "sometimes obscurely stated appeals for the rapid decentralization of economic and political power, the signing of the Union Treaty among the individual republics, the elaboration of a draft new constitution, and the holding of direct elections of legislators and presidents, is possible during this year."

The confident turn for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations, which is quite likely this week, is a result of the major groundwork remaining from the strenuous work of past years. At the same time, this reflects the direct cause-and-effect link between our internal concord and the degree of trust which the international community is beginning to feel in our country.

Bush Chemical Weapons Policy: 'Major Progress'

PM1605155991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 May 91 First Edition p 3

[A. Golts "Military-Political Commentary": "A Danger They Realized Too Late"]

[Text] I cannot bring myself to write that war may produce some positive results in international life, but that is what seems to have happened this time. U.S. President G. Bush has issued a statement on the problem of chemical weapons. The Gulf war, he stressed, once again evoked the specter of chemical weapons and demonstrated that unscrupulous regimes can and will threaten terror with these weapons as long as we allow these weapons to exist. It was this fact, the head of the U.S. Administration pointed out, that prompted him to submit an initiative that should facilitate the quickest conclusion of a convention banning chemical weapons and destroying stockpiles.

What is the essence of the initiative? The United States is officially renouncing the use of chemical weapons for any purpose, including for a retaliatory strike against any state. This decision will be implemented when the convention banning chemical weapons enters into force. As far I can see, this constitutes major progress in the U.S. stance. After all, prior to this the United States admitted the possibility of using chemical weapons in retaliation even after the conclusion of the convention. This, however, aroused understandable suspicions among the other countries involved in the Geneva talks.

Another positive element is the United States' avowed readiness, regardless of other states, to destroy chemical weapons stockpiles within 10 years of the convention's entry into force. Washington did not confine itself to suggesting that other countries follow this example. It stated its readiness to offer technical assistance to ensure that the destruction of toxic agents worldwide is carried out effectively and safely.

I think that the latter is of great importance for the Soviet Union too. The USSR possesses considerable stocks of these weapons. I must be honest and admit that we have encountered serious difficulties in practically resolving the problems involved in destroying these weapons. It is the opinion of our specialists who visited Johnston Atoll in the Pacific and saw the operational installation for the destruction of chemical munitions that the Americans have made marked achievements in this sphere. So technical assistance could prove extremely opportune.

The President's statement indicates that Washington is prepared to help eliminate another obstacle retarding the conference's work. Many experts have, up to this time, expressed doubt as to the possibility of effectively verifying fulfillment of the convention. The United States has now suggested new methods of monitoring to inspect facilities suspected of producing or storing chemical weapons.

Thus many knots that seemed extremely tangled yesterday are being unraveled today with striking ease. Provided the will is there, so to speak. Will the U.S. latest initiative bring about rapid progress at the Geneva conference that began 14 May? I would, of course, like to think so. But I am afraid that a number of developing countries differ somewhat from Washington in their view of the Gulf war, experience of which prompted the U.S. President to submit the new initiatives. People in these countries saw how many problems the possibility of Iraq using toxic agents caused the mighty U.S. grouping and the psychological effect that the threat of using these weapons against peaceful cities had. I think that this might have reinforced some people's idea that chemical weapons are an effective "poor man's atom bomb." I also suspect that some states will be in no hurry to part with their chemical weapons in conditions where Washington has begun to talk about a "new world order" in which the United States is given the role of world gendarme. While some will rush to obtain them.

So people in Washington have realized too late the danger of chemical death. Both the United States and the Soviet Union must now make considerable extra effort to conclude the convention. Far more than would have been necessary had the United States submitted this initiative before war broke out in the Gulf....

Churkin Views PRC Talks, Angola, Other Issues

LD1605162691 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 16 May 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—Chinese Communist Party Secretary Jiang Zemin's visit to Moscow and Sino-Soviet talks were in the focus of attention of journalists at the Soviet Foreign Ministry's briefing here today.

Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaly Churkin declined to offer any detail commentary saying that the talks were still underway. Along with this, he described the agreement on the state border between the USSR and China in its eastern part signed in Moscow today as "a major achievement that will facilitate further normalization and stabilization of Sino-Soviet relations".

Asked about the Soviet Union's stance on sales of arms to China, Vitaliy Churkin said, "We do not rule out the possibility of selling arms to China".

Speaking about Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh's eight-day tour of the Middle East and Geneva, Churkin described it as "well-timed, productive and necessary".

Churkin then announced that according to a previous agreement Hungarian Foreign Minister Geza Jeszenzsky would pay a working visit to the Soviet Union on May 23, 1991.

The Soviet spokesman welcomed the decision by the Angolan government and the units leadership to adopt a package of peace agreements initialled in Lisbon on May 1. "The Soviet Union," Churkin said, "as an observer at intra-Angolan talks congratulates the Angolan sides on this event and expresses hope that during the period of time remaining before the signing of the peace agreements (due to take place in the Portuguese capital on May 31—note by TASS corr.) the Angolan government and units, as well as all those involved in the conflict, will make maximum efforts to undeviatingly adhere to agreemets already reached in order to finally establish peace in Angola".

Vitaliy Churkin also commented on the results of the general elections on a multi-party basis, which were held in Nepal on May 12, for the first time in 32 years in that Asian country. The Soviet spokesman wished "success to the process of democratization" and "productive activity to the newly-elected parliament". "I am sure," Churkin said, "that relations between the USSR and Nepal will further develop in the spirit of traditional friendship, cooperation and mutual understanding".

'Contradictory Rumors' on Gorbachev, G-7 Summit

PM1605194791 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 17 May 91 p 3

[IAN report: "G-7 and Gorbachev"]

[Text] Contradictory rumors are continuing to circulate in the British capital about the possibility of Mikhail Gorbachev's being invited to a G-7 summit. Circles close to the government are refuting the claim made by a local newspaper that Prime Minister J. Major is trying to win the consent of the other G-7 members to inviting the Soviet leader as an observer.

Shcherbakov, Primakov To Attend G-7 Meeting

LD1605205891 Hamburg DPA in German 1818 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Moscow (DPA/VWD)—USSR Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov and Yevgeniy Primakov, Gorbachev's adviser, will represent the USSR at the next G-7 meeting of leading Western industrial nations, in Washington. The Soviet news agency INTERFAX reported this evening. According to Shcherbakov, USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and the head of the Soviet Foreign Policy Association, former Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, have "worked intensively on a plan for cooperation with the big seven for over a year."

World Health Assembly on Chernobyl Aid

LD1605100691 Moscow TASS in English 2125 GMT 15 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vitaliy Makarchev]

[Text] Geneva May 15 TASS—The session of the World Health Assembly, now under way in Geneva, adopted a resolution calling on all countries to participate in the implementation of the international Chernobyl programme.

Assembly participants requested the director-general of the World Health Organisation (WHO) to find additional extra-budgetary funds to finance the programme.

The outlines of the programme, the aim of which is to give medical and preventive aid to people afflicted by the Chernobyl disaster, were drafted at the initiative of the Soviet Public Health Ministry and the WHO a year ago.

Some measures are now being fulfilled under the programme in the USSR. Preparations are now in progress for mass and detailed medical checkup of people in stricken areas, and equipment and medicine are being purchased to treat children.

An international medico-radiation centre is being established in Obninsk and its regional branches in the Ukraine, Belorussia and the Bryansk region, Russian Federation.

Soviet Public Health Minister Igor Denisov, head of the Soviet delegation at the assembly, said in an interview with TASS that the resolution is another step towards an international system of aid to people, whose health was afflicted by the Chernobyl disaster.

United States & Canada

Soviet GRU Chief Cited on Alleged Defector

PM1605200591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 May 91 Union Edition p 8

[Article by S. Mostovshchikov under "Details for IZVESTIYA" rubric: "'Diplomat' Defects to United States"]

[Text] The world's mass media have reported that Aleksandr Krapiva, a 41-year-old staffer at the Soviet Embassy in Austria, has abandoned his official duties as "diplomat" and sought political asylum in the United States. News agencies are reporting that Aleksandr Krapiva is a "high-ranking officer with Soviet military intelligence."

In the words of Army General Vladlen Mikhaylov, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry Main Intelligence Directorate [GRU], whom IZVESTIYA asked to comment, no one named Krapiva was a high-ranking officer. He was a "plain rascal." Incidentally, the general refused to give the rascal's actual military rank. He did say that the intelligence operative was a senior officer, but had no access to any major secret documents. By way of argument Vladlen Mikhaylov gave the following information: "This Krapiva has never even set foot in the building where we are having this conversation."

Krapiva had not been in that building but he had been abroad. Austria was his second foreign posting (the United States was his first). Although, judging by the GRU chief's information, the intelligence officer had not reached the Shtirlits level, his experience was quite sufficient to enable him to abide by all the rules of secrecy in leaving Vienna by car with his wife and two children, traveling to the FRG, and thence to the United States, where he requested political asylum. According to the available information, representatives of the Soviet Foreign Ministry met with Krapiva in the United States, but the intelligence officer showed no desire during the conversation to return to the motherland. That was three months ago.

In his talk with this IZVESTIYA correspondent Army Gen. Mikhaylov did not give any figures on the number of his subordinates who turn traitor. Regarding defectors, he merely said that "such things happen from time to time." Asked how often U.S. intelligence officers seek political asylum in our country, the GRU chief honestly replied: "Less often."

China

Jiang Zemin Visit Enters Second Day

TASS Reports Talks' 2d Round

LD1605204991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1755 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 16 May (TASS)—It is reported officially here that talks continued in the Kremlin on 16 May between M.S. Gorbachev and Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee and chairman of the PRC Central Military Commission. There was a thorough analysis of the main fields of bilateral cooperation and discussion of the prospects for its enrichment in the interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union and China.

M.S. Gorbachev and Jiang Zemin confirmed the adherence of the USSR and the PRC to the principles and accords enshrined in the 1989 Soviet-Chinese communique. This has permitted the two countries in the past two years to raise their relations to the level of progressive, good-neighborly development.

The two leaders noted the paramount role of mutual political understanding and trust in the overall range of Soviet-Chinese relations.

M.S. Gorbachev stressed, in particular, the topicality of making more active use of the great potential for mutually advantageous economic cooperation. The two countries' geographical proximity, the length of the border uniting them, and the way their national economies are mutually complementary all testify to the expediency of broader, more stable, and longer-term ties. Cooperation in traditional fields, power engineering, metallurgy, and transportation can be successfully supplemented by interaction in the production of consumer goods and in agriculture, as well as in such modern spheres as nuclear power engineering, the civil aviation industry, space, and many other science-based areas.

Great prospects are being opened up for cooperation between academic establishments and laboratories and for an exchange between young scientists and postgraduate students.

Contacts, interaction, and cooperation can proceed successfully at both the central and other levels, particularly in border provinces and regions. M.S. Gorbachev noted in this connection the opportunities and the interest of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and the other Soviet republics in broadening cooperation.

Comrade Jiang Zemin also spoke in favor of the active development of economic links. Mutual interest was noted in the development of exchanges in the sphere of culture, medicine, and sport.

It was stipulated that the ministers and heads of departments would, in their direct contacts, make a thorough examination of existing problems and the prospects for mutual cooperation and would contribute toward its expansion and further renewal.

Comrade Jiang Zemin shared and supported M.S. Gorbachev's idea that the development of Soviet-Chinese relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence would help strengthen the stability and mutual advantageousness of these relations, irrespective of any conjunct or attendant factors.

On behalf of the Soviet leadership, M.S. Gorbachev expressed gratitude to the Chinese leadership and all the Chinese people for their friendly support for the processes of renewal in the Soviet Union, as well as the concrete assistance which is being expressed, among other things, in the supplies to the Soviet consumer market of certain Chinese consumer goods that are popular in our country.

A useful role in this is played by direct contacts between enterprises, economic associations, and whole branches of the economy. The participants of the talks shared the view that the strengthening of internal stability in such large and complex countries as the Soviet Union and China is of enormous and fundamental importance for international stability in Europe and Asia, and therefore for the world.

The Soviet-Chinese talks took place in an open, amicable, and friendly atmosphere. Taking part were:

On the Soviet side: V.A. Ivashko, Yu.D. Maslyukov, A.A. Bessmertnykh, K.F. Katushev, D.T. Yazov, V.M. Falin, I.A. Rogachev, V.L. Musatov, and N.N. Solovyev;

On the Chinese side: Qin Jiwei, Qian Qichen, Wen Jiabao, Zhu Liang, Li Lanqing, Wang Weichen, Li Shuzhen, and Yu Hongliang.

At the end of the Kremlin talks, USSR Foreign Minister A. Bessmertnykh and Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen signed an agreement between the USSR and the PRC on the eastern part of the Soviet-Chinese state border. Present at the signing ceremony were M.S. Gorbachev and Jiang Zemin as well as all those who took part in the talks.

Jiang Zemin Meets Pavlov

CM1705085591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 May 91 Second Edition p 4

["Exchange of Opinions"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov 16 May met General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Chairman of the Central Military Council Jiang Zemin, who is staying in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

During talks, Jiang Zemin noted that China follows with great attention the social, economic, and political transformations in the Soviet Union, and is aware of their great importance despite the fact that each country has its peculiarities that cannot be disregarded in the course of the reform. China also intends consistently to carry out policy of opening up its economy and developing market relations, to seek the right combination of plan and market.

Pavlov stressed that the transformations in the two countries create favorable conditions for profound cooperation of the Soviet Union and China, dwelt on a number of principled moments that make it possible to further expand Soviet-Chinese interaction and put it to a fundamentally new level, commensurate with the potential and interests of the two country.

When considering some practical issues of Soviet-Chinese relations, the two men expressed satisfaction with the state of bilateral economic links in various fields, the pace of realization of the long-term program for developing trade, economic, scientific and technological cooperation.

They stressed the importance of a search for new, long-term spheres of mutually advantageous ties, for which all the necessary prerequisites exist.

The meeting was held in the atmosphere of friendly mutual understanding.

Jiang Zemin Meets Lukyanov

LD1605154191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1433 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 16 May (TASS)—A conversation was held in the Kremlin today between Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CCP Central Committee and chairman of the PRC Central Military Commission.

The high-ranking Chinese guest was informed about the activity of the USSR supreme body of power, about the work on preparations for the new Union treaty, and the course of the discussion of issues on the agenda of the Supreme Soviet. For his part, Jiang Zemin spoke about the implementation of reforms in China and about the system of consultations operating in the country with democratic parties and organizations which function under the leadership of the Communist Party.

The sides noted the growing level of Soviet-Chinese relations with satisfaction, including in the sphere of parliamentary ties, and expressed hope that they will continue to grow stronger.

The conversation took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

TASS Reports Border Agreement

LD1605124891 Moscow TASS in English 1235 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—The Soviet Union and China signed an agreement on the eastern leg of their state border today. The agreement was signed by Foreign Ministers Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and Qian Qichen.

The Kremlin ceremony was attended by President and Soviet Communist Party leader Mikhail Gorbachev and Chinese Communist Party leader Jiang Zemin, who is also chairman of the Chinese Central Military Council.

The ceremony followed another round of summit talks, which also involved the foreign ministers of the two countries.

The Chinese leader is to receive Moscow representatives and activists from the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society at the Chinese Embassy in Moscow later today.

He is also expected to grant an interview to Soviet television.

Jiang Zemin Meets Friendship Group

CM1705085391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 May 91 Second Edition p 4

["Stay in Moscow"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Visiting Chinese leader Jiang Zemin and activists of the Sino-Soviet Friendship Society and other members of the Soviet public had a friendly meeting in the Chinese Embassy in Moscow on Thursday.

The meeting was attended by scientists, historians, diplomats, journalists and people of other occupations who have contributed to the consolidation of bilateral contacts and the development of relations between the peoples of the two countries.

The Chinese leader warmly welcomed the guests. He stressed that practical contribution to the cause of improving relations between the two countries and peoples had been made by the Sino-Soviet Friendship Society which united true friends of his country. Jiang wished success to this public organisation and expressed confidence that it will successfully continue its fruitful activity.

Speaking on behalf of Soviet people, Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Secretary Valentin Kuptsov expressed gratitude to the Chinese leadership for arranging the meeting. He said the meeting was being attended by a group of veterans who remembered very well how Sino-Soviet friendship originated in the fifties. There was much good and mutually beneficial in our relations at that time, he said.

But along with that, the Soviet Communist leader continued to say, seeds were sawn which later gave rise to mutual mistrust and alienation. The fact that the hard times now belong to the past is viewed by the Soviet people with relief and gladness.

"We are aware of the degree of responsibility which the present generation has to bear in building new Sino-Soviet relations, which, we hope, will for ever be a powerful factor in strengthening international peace and stability.

In a warm non-formal atmosphere of the meeting, the Chinese leader spoke about his impressions from his stay in Moscow and about life in his country.

Also on Thursday, Jiang Zemin visited the mausoleum of Vladimir Lenin and laid a wreath there. He also laid a wreath at the tomb of the unknown soldier.

Communique on Talks Issued

LD1605190591 Moscow TASS in English 1833 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—"The participants in the talks shared the view that the strengthening of internal stability in such large and complex countries as the Soviet Union and China is crucial for international stability in Europe, Asia and the entire world." This is said in an official communique on the talks between President Mikhail Gorbachev and Chinese Communist Party Chief and chairman of the Central Military Council Jiang Zemin today.

The two leaders analyzed in detail the guidelines for bilateral relations and discussed prospects for their enrichment in the interests of Soviet and Chinese peoples.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Jiang Zemin stressed the paramount role of political understanding and trust in the entire complex of Soviet-Chinese relations.

Jiang Zemin also shared and supported Gorbachev's idea that the development of Soviet-Chinese relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence would help strengthen stability and mutual advantage of these relations, irrespective of any time-serving factors.

On behalf of the Soviet leadership, Gorbachev expressed gratitude to the Chinese leader and the entire Chinese people for friendly support to the renewal process in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet-Chinese talks were held in an open, good neighbourly, friendly atmosphere.

PRC Spokesman Cited on Talks

LD1605191591 Moscow TASS in English 1827 GMT 16 May 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman briefed Soviet and foreign journalists in Moscow today on a meeting of Soviet President, General Secretary Of The CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev with visiting general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, chairman of the Central Military Council Jiang Zemin.

Wu Jianmin said the talks between the Soviet and Chinese leaders were held "in a wide circle". The goal of Jiang Zemin's visit is to foster friendly relations of mutually advantageous cooperation and long-term stable ties with the USSR. He noted the great importance of a regular exchange of views and contacts at a high level, especially in the current conditions of extremely complex international situation.

Jiang Zemin described as a great event the conclusion of the agreement on the eastern section of the Soviet-Chinese border. Both sides, the spokesman said, expressed readiness, in accordance with the spirit of the joint Soviet-Chinese communique of 1989, to continue talks on unsettled border issues in order to settle them as soon as possible.

As for the talks on mutual reductions of armed forces in the border area, Jiang Zemin expressed hope that both sides would exert efforts, by means of friendly consultations, to attain a comprehensive agreement.

The Chinese spokesman drew the journalists' attention to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's statement that the development of Soviet-Chinese relations meets the legitimate interests of peoples of the two countries and is the focus of attention throughout the world, that the Soviet side is prepared to extend relations with China in various fields, and sees no obstacles to it.

The Soviet and Chinese leaders also exchanged views on the international situation, Wu Jianmin said. However, at today's talks the sides "did not raise concrete issues" which will be discussed tomorrow by foreign ministers of the two countries.

Wu Jianmin said that Jiang Zemin invited Gorbachev to pay a visit to China.

Then Wu Jianmin briefed journalists on Jiang Zemin's meeting with Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Anatoly Lukyanov, who highly assessed the importance of the Chinese leader's visit to the USSR, saying that the overwhelming majority of USSR people's deputies is in favour of developing Soviet-Chinese relations.

During the conversation the sides expressed the view that inter- parliamentary contacts play a very important role in strengthening friendship and understanding between the peoples of the two countries and give impetus to developing and extending bilateral relations.

Speaking about today's talks between Jiang Zemin and Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, Wu Jianmin quoted Pavlov as saying that the Soviet Union showed interest in the successful combination of the market mechanism and state management in China, especially in how China tackles the property problem.

When discussing trade and economic cooperation, Pavlov said that although the two countries' trade turnover reached in 1990 three billion roubles, it is very little in per capita terms. He said this proved that the sides possessed a sizeable potential in this field. For his part, Jiang Zemin expressed interest of the Chinese side in developing trade and economic cooperation with the Soviet Union and hope that common efforts would help expand it.

In replies to journalists, Wu Jianmin said the Taiwan issue was raised during the Soviet-Chinese talks in Moscow. The Chinese leader, he said, stressed that the Chinese position on that issue remained unchanged: Taiwan is an inalienable part of the territory of the Chinese People's Republic and its government is the only legitimate representative of the entire Chinese people. The Chinese side flatly rejects any attempts to create two Chinas or one country with two governments. The Soviet side supports this position, Wu Jianmin stressed.

Northeast Asia

Visiting ROK House Leader Interviewed in Moscow

SK1705093591 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1200 GMT 16 May 91

[Interview with Pak Chun-kyu, speaker of the ROK National Assembly, by station reporter Suikov—place and date not given]

[Text] As already reported, upon the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the ROK National Assembly delegation led by Speaker Pak Chun-kyu is on an official visit to our country.

After the end of the official visit, the head of the delegation held an interview with the station reporter.

[Suikov] Speaker Pak, what is the basic purpose of your delegation's visit to the Soviet Union?

[Pak Chun-kyu] Representing the ROK National Assembly, I, along with the floor leader of the ruling party, the minister of state for political affairs, and seven to eight lawmakers are paying an official visit to the Soviet Union. The main purpose of the visit is to establish a direction and put into practice the issues that were raised during the three rounds of summit talks between President Gorbachev and President No. No other countries have held summit talks three times in one year. Also, it is necessary to have exchanges among lawmakers to maintain the agreements reached in the summit talks.

Agreements from the summit talks must receive support from the people, and in order to receive support from the people, they must have support from the National Assembly, which represents the people. Therefore, I felt that it was necessary to have exchanges, frequent contacts, and discussions between the lawmakers of the two countries. In order to strengthen and develop the results of the summit talks, I felt that our National Assembly must take the initiative.

President Gorbachev's report on the results of the ROK-USSR summit talks at the Supreme Soviet was very encouraging. He also highly assessed the ROK's international position and economic developments, and talked about the unpretentious friendship that we have towards the Soviet Union. In the past the Soviet congress had not organized any friendship associations with the congresses of any other countries, but an agreement was reached between the ROK and the USSR to organize such an association, and to hold discussions on various

fields of common interest. Therefore, I think the purpose of our visit has almost been fulfilled.

I believe that the result of our delegation's visit to the Soviet Union will strengthen the friendship between the peoples of the ROK and the USSR, and will contribute to putting into practice the results of the summit talks. Also, the ROK's press featured our delegation's visit to the Soviet Union. This shows that the Korean people also want to develop relations with the Soviet Union.

[Suikov] Speaker Pak, please tell me in detail about your meetings with Soviet leaders, President Gorbachev and Anatoliy Luk'yanov.

[Pak] I met with President Gorbachev for and estimated time of more than 30 minutes and held discussions with Chairman Lukyanov for over one and a half hours.

Since President Gorbachev is faced with a domestic crisis I tried not to present concrete and difficult issues. However, the president himself brought up the pending issues between the ROK and the USSR. I had time to hold talks on historical and fundamental issues from a philosophical, historic, and fundamental viewpoint regarding the future of the world peace, the issue of peace, cooperation, and prosperity in Northeast Asia, and the establishing the historic relations between the ROK-USSR.

I felt that the future outlook, plan, and interest shown by President Gorbachev coincided with ours in every aspect. This was very encouraging.

I held open, concrete talks with the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. One of the issues was our brothers in the North. We, as well as the Soviet Union, are of the same opinion regarding this matter. That is, we do not want to isolate North Korea but want to maintain friendly relations with North Korea, with the help of the Soviet Union. It was very encouraging that both sides reached complete agreement on dealing with North Korea.

[Suikov] Speaker Pak, in your opinion, what is your view on the issue of trade and economic relations between the USSR-ROK and the prospects for cooperation in the international arena between the two countries?

[Pak] The prospects for economic cooperation between the ROK and the Soviet Union is a matter of great concern. We do not mean to (?learn) from the Soviet Union. Only when perestroyka succeeds can the ROK-Soviet relations which are in an incipient stage (?develop).

Also, it is thanks to the victory attained by the Soviet Union in perestroyka and glasnost, the so-called policy built on new thinking, that the world has freed itself from the structure of the cold war that had existed for 40 years. Escaping from the cold war structure is the only way out for the Korean people.

So, to be of some use to perestroyka, that is, being of some help to President Gorbachev's (?policy) is in the interest of the ROK. This is the reason why our two countries should promote economic cooperation.

The ROK and the Soviet Union can be mutually complementary. In terms of industry and basic science, our country is in need of great efforts for development. This is why we should rely on the Soviet Union. I also think that Korea has a lot of things that can help the Soviet Union, including daily necessities that are in acute short supply in the Soviet Union.

ROK businessmen and government officials in charge of economic affairs are now trying to [word indistinct] considerably, with industriousness and a positive attitude. Moreover, they are hot-headed to put it a little critically. To put it mildly, they are so active.

Unlike other countries, the ROK and the Soviet Union will achieve concrete success in economic areas in their bilateral relations in the shortest period of time. I hope that conditions for cooperation will be created at the earliest possible date in order to make such success possible.

After arriving in the Soviet Union, I have found that the Supreme Soviet is doing its best to create such conditions. So, I am very optimistic about the economic cooperation between the ROK and the Soviet Union. I also am convinced that the trade volume between our two countries will be, at least, well over $10 billion by 1995, four years from now. I also believe that the economic cooperation between the ROK and the Soviet Union will bring visible effects.

What is striking about the current global situation is that the two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, began to see such things as global peace from the same perspective and that this will greatly affect Northeast Asia.

It is my belief that if the ROK; our old and traditional friend, the United States; and our new friend, the Soviet Union; cooperate with one another, we will be able to lay a new foundation for peace and cooperation in Northeast Asia. Years ago, when President Gorbachev took office, we were pessimistic about the future relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, meaning that we were wondering whether these two countries would ever come closer.

I think that the two countries must not have any hegemonist or militarist ambitions in Northeast Asia, that a foundation for mutual cooperation should be established in Northeast Asia, that [words indistinct]. I also think that as long as they have no territorial ambitions, the interest of these two countries and those of the ROK ambitions, the interest of these two countries and those of the ROK are identical. So, I thought that the three countries must do their best in setting up the starting point of solidifying peace in Northeast Asia.

What is more, I am convinced that the Korean people should be able to make such a great contribution if and when the North and South are peacefully reunified, which will be rewarding to the Korean people.

Back in Seoul the Korean people are considerably concerned about the exaggerated and superficial reports on perestroyka, and on the domestic political situation in the Soviet Union as a whole. However, our parliamentary delegation believes that [words indistinct], hoping that perestroyka should succeed without fail.

[Passage indistinct] I believe that the Soviet people, too, will continue (?national development) according to President Gorbachev's initiatives, while keeping their historical tradition and cultural traditions alive, even though they may come across some (?difficulties).

I think that the economic cooperation in ROK-Soviet relations should be intensified and the National Assembly of the ROK will make efforts in this direction. In the same context, I also think that the South and North should also become closer. There can be no such thing as an ideological barrier.

I believe that if the peoples of the two countries, the ROK and the Soviet Union, have nothing to hold back from the other and will cooperate with each other in order to enjoy greater freedom and prosperity. This will contribute to a decent, humane, and rewarding life, and it will help make perestroyka a success.

Japanese View of Soviet 'Threat' Noted

LD1605082791 Moscow TASS in English 2056 GMT 15 May 91

[By TASS political analyst Askold Biryukov]

[Text] Moscow May 15 TASS—It seems that Japanese Defence Agency officials found a new "puzzle" for themselves, the solution of which could support Japan's intention with military arguments to play a more prominent political role in the world.

The YOMIURI newspaper reports that "the Japanese Defence Agency again begins to stress a potential threat of the Soviet armed forces in the Far East," which was struck out of the white paper on defence for 1990.

It is clear from the newspaper article that the agency is preparing an appropriate "substantiation" "to reanimate" this threat. "A substantiation," which, despite known facts about unilateral Soviet steps to reduce its armed forces in the Far East, would allege the contrary: A threat from these forces grows and, consequently, needs a response.

Things went to such lengths that some high-ranking officials claimed: "It will be possible to speak about the absence of the threat only if the Soviet armed forces in the Far East are cut five times."

Indeed, why not 10, 15 or 20 times?

The Japanese Foreign Ministry explained in the past that the wording about a "potential threat" from the Soviet armed forces was struck out of the white paper due to political reasons.

YOMIURI writes that this was done "at the initiative of Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu, taking into account the forthcoming visit to Japan by Soviet President Gorbachev."

If this is the case, the present efforts by the Japanese Defence Agency are of doubtful benefit for the Kaifu government. Indeed, the following question comes to mind: How sincere was the government's decision not to write about a "potential Soviet military threat" in the white paper?

Was this decision prompted by a realistic appraisal of the Soviet actions to cut its armed forces, to freeze, reduce and destroy armaments in the Far East or was it a desire to create a suitable atmosphere on the eve of the Soviet-Japanese summit?

In the joint Soviet-Japanese statement on the summit's results, the two sides unanimously pointed to the need to strengthen the trends for easing tension in the international situation and to the importance of expanding the dialogue and contacts between the two countries on the large range of issues, including security and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region.

The Japanese Defence Agency could use this document to resolve its doubts and suspicions concerning a "Soviet military threat."

In his speech at the Japanese parliament, Mikhail Gorbachev explained in detail Soviet measures to cut armed forces in the Asia-Pacific region, noting that the USSR would decrease its military presence in the region.

"This process would accelerate, if other naval powers display reciprocity," he said. "I'd like to stress: The Soviet Union is ready to begin a dialogue with Japan on military issues.

"This could remove mutual anxieties. Proposals have been conveyed to your government," the president said.

Incidentally, the KYODO TSUSHIN news agency noted that the USSR began to reduce its ground force on the Kuril island early this month, which, the agency believes, is in full conformity with the results of the Soviet-Japanese summit.

Indeed, it would be better to follow understandings achieved during the summit in Tokyo rather than generate new mistrust towards each other.

Commentary on Okinawa Reversion Anniversary

OW1705015191 Moscow Radio Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1100 GMT 15 May 91

[Commentary by Kalinin, Radio Moscow military affairs commentator]

[Text] Listeners, it was on 15 May 1972, or 19 years ago, that the agreement on the reversion of Okinawa's administrative authority was put into effect. In this connection, Radio Moscow military affairs commentator Kalinin states the following:

To be honest, I feel rather hesitant about taking up an issue which is connected to Okinawa's reversion in this Radio Moscow program. Maybe it is because I am strongly impressed by the idea that it would be better to avoid anything that might arouse criticism against my own country. While Okinawa has been returned, the issue of the northern territories still remains unsettled. Therefore, it seems inevitable that criticism will be made against our nation. However, after thoughtful consideration, I have decided not to avert my eyes from this theme.

First of all, since I am convinced that the border dispute between the Soviet Union and Japan is in the process of settlement at the official level and it will certainly be settled eventually, I think there are no grounds for denouncing the Soviet Union.

Secondly, there are similarities between the Okinawan issue and the northern territorial issue but the similarity does not exist when these issues are viewed [words indinstinct] from the standpoint of international law. The similarity lies in the fact that both Okinawa and the southern Kuril islands are involved in military policies.

As is known, Okinawa has been one of the [words indistinct] for the United States and Asia-Pacific region in the past as well as at the present. Three-fourths of the U.S. military bases and facilities in Japan are concentrated on this island. The strategic air force units of the U.S. forces in the Asia-Pacific region, as well as the Third Division of the U.S. Marine Corps who can be dispatched to any part of the world, are deployed on Okinawa, and the number of U.S. troops stationed there amounts to over 35,000.

Meanwhile, a considerably important military role has been assigned to the southern Kuril islands. However, the Soviet troops deployed there are quite different from the U.S. forces stationed on Okinawa in both structure and mission. The data of the General Staff Headquarters of the Soviet forces indicate that the Soviet troops deployed on the southern Kuril islands belong to an artillery division, and when strength and equipment are taken into consideration, these troops are capable of carrying out defense tasks only. Moreover, the total number of troops is approximately 4000; these units do not have attack measures nor measures for sending troops overseas; and they are not equipped with aircraft or helicopters for use in landing operations.

The difference between the U.S. military presence on Okinawa and the Soviet military presence on the southern Kuril islands does not stop here. Almost 20 years have elapsed since the reversion of Okinawa. However, this island's role as the military stronghold for U.S. forces still remains unchanged. When all factors are taken into consideration, no major changes can be expected in this area.

Incidentally, as President Gorbachev announced during his recent visit to Japan, Soviet troops deployed on the southern Kuril islands will be reduced and they will be completely withdrawn sooner or later. Furthermore, these measures will be taken despite the fact that these islands are under Soviet legal jurisdiction. Thus, the Soviet Union will once again indicate its readiness to take steps to reduce its military presence not only overseas but also in the eastern part of the nation. Moreover, the Soviet Union has made a proposal for jointly abolishing military presence in foreign nations by the year 2000. And last year, the Soviet Union completed the withdrawal of its troops from Mongolia and also decreased the use of the Cam Ranh Bay.

However, what I want to stress here is that regional military tension cannot be defused merely through unilateral actions. It is essential that other nations, the United States in particular, takes action. It is precisely to this point that attention must be paid when the 19th anniversary of Okinawa's reversion is celebrated.

Troops Said Leaving Islands Off Hokkaido

OW1405111791 Tokyo KYODO in English 1100 GMT 14 May 91

[Text] Kurilsk, Soviet Union, May 14 KYODO—Soviet ground troops deployed on the four Soviet-held islands off Hokkaido have begun withdrawing in line with Moscow's pledge to reduce its military strength on the islands, a high-ranking local official said Tuesday.

The official in Kuril District, Sakhalin, told KYODO NEWS SERVICE that 300 to 400 soldiers began withdrawing from Kurilsk (Shyana in Japanese) in central Etorofu Island, one of the four disputed islands, around May 6 under an order from the Defense Ministry.

The withdrawal will be completed in a few months, the official added.

According to the official, Soviet troops have also started to withdraw from Kunashiri, Shikotan, and the Habomais following Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Japan in April.

The official said the Soviet Union will pull out its ground troops, mainly consisting of artillery, from the islands.

While one of the some 90 radio telephone operators who left the island Monday told KYODO reporters that they

were heading for Kunashiri Island, the official said the troops being pulled out will be demobilized, not redeployed in other areas.

The official, however, did not elaborate on the size of the Soviet troop withdrawal.

He added that he thinks Air Force members stationed on Etorofu Island will be excluded from the withdrawal, and that some ground troops will stay on the islands as well.

The official urged Japan to reduce the strength of its Self-Defense Forces deployment in Hokkaido in response to the ongoing Soviet pullout from the islands.

The partial withdrawal may be aimed at reducing military tensions on the islands to help Moscow win economic cooperation from Japan, analysts said.

Gorbachev made the proposal to reduce forces on the four islands during talks with Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu in Tokyo in April.

Last week in Tokyo, a Soviet diplomatic source said the Soviet proposal to cut forces on the islands is unilateral and will not be linked to a reduction in U.S. forces stationed at Misawa Air Base in northern Japan. Some 10,000 Soviet troops are believed to be deployed on the four islands.

Defense Ministry Denies Cuts

PM1605201391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 May 91 First Edition p 6

[Report by B. Pipiya: "'Canard' Over Kurils"]

[Text] Reports have appeared in some of the Western mass media about an alleged reduction in the Soviet Armed Forces subunits stationed on the Kuriles.

This PRAVDA correspondent asked Lieutenant General V. Manilov, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry Information Directorate, to explain.

"The reports of a Soviet troop withdrawal from the Kurils," Valeriy Leonidovich replied, "are totally without foundation and do not correspond to reality. These rumors are being spread for provocative purposes by those forces with have an interest in exacerbating Soviet-Japanese relations and who want to hamper the incipient constructive process between the two countries."

East Europe

Slovene Delegation Arrives in Moscow for Talks

LD1505100991 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0812 GMT 15 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 15 May (TANJUG)—The Slovene delegation led by Lojze Peterle, prime minister of the Republic of Slovenia, arrived last last night in Moscow for talks on cooperation between this Yugoslav republic and Russia and the USSR. The Slovene delegation which contains Dimitrije Rupel, republican minister for foreign affairs, and Franc Horvat, president of the Chamber of Economy, were welcomed by representatives of the Russian Federation and the Yugoslav Embassy.

The Slovene delegation had talks this morning with Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers, and it will also have talks with Konstantin Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations and Kondrat Terekh, minister of trade. During the day talks are expected in the Soviet and Russian Ministries of Foreign Affairs.

This evening the signing of an agreement between Slovenia and Russia on economic, scientific-technical, and cultural cooperation is envisaged. Tomorrow the delegation will be received by Stefan Sitaryan, vice-chairman of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, and a meeting with Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, is also expected.

Prime Minister Meets Bulgarian Counterpart

LD1705091391 Moscow TASS in English 0859 GMT 17 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 17 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov met his Bulgarian counterpart Dimitr Popov in the Kremlin today.

Popov is in Moscow on a brief working visit. He is also expected to meet Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev.

Popov Pre-Visit Interview

PM1605195991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent A. Kapralov: "Approaching a New Treaty. Bulgarian Premier's Visit to USSR"]

[Text] Sofia—Dimitur Popov, chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers, flies into Moscow 16 May for talks with the Soviet Government. The previous day he gave a TV interview in which he said, in particular, that it is in both countries' interest to conclude a new treaty of cooperation and mutual aid.

The talks, Popov noted, will discuss the options being proposed by the Soviet Union and Bulgaria. The USSR is not imposing and cannot impose any position on us if it is not accepted by the other side. We will talk as equals. I believe that reason and desire will allow us to gradually arrive at a mutually acceptable version of the treaty and sign it in the near future. Perhaps I will sign with Pavlov, or maybe the two countries' presidents will be involved. That, as they say, is a matter of protocol. But we should not consider the state of affairs hopeless now, at the very start of the journey. I believe that we will easily reach mutual understanding with the Soviet leadership.

It is true, Popov went on to say, that our economy has been closely bound up with the Soviet economy. The USSR is our main raw materials supplier and an important source of industrial output. We also sell our goods in this vast, abundant, and—for us—very convenient market. And we have no interest in losing the positions we have already established. This applies not only to the economy, but also to politics, science, and culture.

A certain amount of stagnation has emerged in our relations, Popov stressed, and our governments' aim is to overcome this and leave it behind. It should be consigned to history, while we move toward a new type of relationship that benefits both sides. There can be no question of subordination, diktat, or the imposition of someone else's will; the ideologization of relations is becoming a thing of the past, too.

Poland Soviet Troop Withdrawal Talks Continue

LD1505082591 Warsaw PAP in English 2143 GMT 14 May 91

[By PAP correspondent Jerzy Malczyk]

[Text] Moscow, May 14—A Polish delegation headed by Grzegorz Kostrzewa-Zorbas, deputy director of the European department at the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, began a further round of discussions in Moscow today on the issue of the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Poland, and on arrangements for the transit across Poland of Soviet forces stationed in eastern Germany.

The head of the Polish delegation was received in a 2-hour meeting by Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, the Soviet deputy foreign minister.

West Europe

Gorbachev's Possible UK Visit Viewed

OW1505233991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1814 GMT 14 May 91

[By diplomatic correspondent M. Mayorov; From "Diplomatic Panorama"]

[Text] Rumours have been circulating in the Moscow press that Gorbachev is expected to pay a visit to Great Britain. DP [Diplomatic Panorama] learned from the circles close to the Soviet President that the Soviet leader is not going to Britain unless he can participate in the conference of the leaders of the seven biggest capitalist countries due to be held in London in July. So far as a working meeting between the Soviet and the U.S. presidents is concerned (the press mentioned Gorbachev's possible visit to Britain in this context), its venue will be Moscow as planned previously.

The sources in the Soviet Foreign Ministry DP spoke with said that they did not have any information concerning an invitation to Gorbachev to take part in the London conference. In fact, the matter has thus far been mentioned by a few Western news agencies. For example, Reuter quoted British Foreign Office officials as saying that the forthcoming London conference will largely concentrate on the situation in the USSR and the development of West-East relations. Other sources, including those in Singapore where experts met to define the agenda, maintained that the Persian Gulf crisis and coping with it would be in the centre of attention.

The diplomats DP spoke with denied being in possession of any information confirming that the Soviet Union has a direct stake in participating in the big seven conference. Senior staffer of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Andrey Bugrov said, "Participation per se is nothing."

The interviewees found it difficult to say what Moscow wanted out of the London conference. "We don't take part in these conferences," they said. Thus far, the only form of the Soviet President's involvement may be a missive to the big seven like those he sent to the conferences in Paris and Houston. Nevertheless, the Soviet diplomatic circles were not inclined to underestimate the importance of these messages that mentioned plans of economic reforms in the USSR and prospects for an international economic cooperation emerging in the course of the reforms. These missives provide for political dialogue with such an important international forum as the regular big seven conferences, emphasized Bugrov.

Ignatenko on Decision on Fate of Honecker

AU1705090291 Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG in German 15 May 91 p 4

[ADN report: "No Decision on Honecker's Fate Yet"]

[Text] Moscow—According to Soviet Presidential Spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko, the fate of former GDR head of state and party Erich Honecker will be decided when he recovers. As Ignatenko stated in Moscow yesterday, it is currently difficult to answer the question about Hoencker's future. Ignatenko denied a report by BILD that President Gorbachev had made negative statements about Honecker.

Supreme Soviet

USSR Supreme Soviet 16 May Session Reported

LD1605211791

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1851 GMT on 16 May carries a one-hour program entitled "At the USSR Supreme Soviet" comprising a report with recorded excerpts on the proceedings of the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin, Moscow, on 16 May.

The announcer introduces the program, saying that Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov spoke at the session.

Pavlov requests permission from the USSR Supreme Soviet for Vladimir Shcherbakov to hold, apart from his first deputy prime minister post, the additional post of minister of the economy, and for Nikolay Laverov to be also head the Committee for Science and Technology, in addition to his deputy prime minster post. He also conveyed the request the Stefan Sitaryan to be appointed as deputy prime minister, for Dzhava Rakhimova to be USSR Deputy prime minister in charge of social affairs.

The announcer reports that Pavlov was asked many questions. The Scherbakov, Laverov, and Rakhimova appointments were approved. The Sitaryan appointed was not approved, but his appointment will be voted on again.

Shcherbakov then speaks on legislative measures, which are in the pipeline and are soon to be promulgated. One of the measures deals with children's goods and clothing. He lists decisions made yesterday at the USSR Cabinet of Ministers session. It was decided that the 5 percent sales turnover tax will be lifted on a number of products: sugar, margarine, underwear. Compensation for children up to 16 is to be extended to children who are studying up to the age of 18. There is to be compensation for students, and material protection of population in connection with increased retail prices.

Shcherbakov touches on higher rates for workers in mines, metallurgy, etc. and on what is to be done with the 1 percent tax on pensions.

He notes that as a first deputy prime minister he has been endowed with the authority to sign instructions, whereas Deputy Prime Minister Maslyukov dealing with specific matters in hand has not. He says this is a mistake by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The announcer reports that the KGB law was adopted. KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov was invited to speak.

Following this, Kryuchkov thanks them for adopting the law. It was long awaited by the KGB organs and they themselves acted as initiators of this law. He asks for further assistance from the USSR Supreme Soviet praises it for the work it has done and stresses the importance of a single union.

Ivan Laptev speaks on results of work done by the reconciliation commission on the law on travel into and out of the USSR. Three proposals were submitted to with foreign minister taking part in the work. Travel should not be at the expense of the state and occur on market principles: refers to Article 18. All foreign ministers of the Union republics spoke out in favor of adopting the law. The law is not only about people leaving the USSR but also about people going on trips abroad; such a right to travel is an elementary right. The degree of socialism of the USSR is measured by the extent to which Soviet citizens are free.

Later, Anatolly Lukyanov reads a note demanding that as chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet he state his viewpoint on the law in question. He says that as a deputy he is in favor of the adoption of this law. Yuriy Kalmykov recalls that the law was adopted in its first reading in 1989. He says if we do not adopt this law we will harm our country and undermine the prestige of our parliament.

Yuriy Sharipov says that adoption of law is fully supported in his commission. He notes that there has never been labor emigration in the USSR. Emigration should be turned into labor emigration, not permanent emigration

Tadeush Pupkevich then speaks as one of the six members of the reconciliation commission, saying he is the only one with a different viewpoint. He says the USSR does not have the money to finance the implementation of this law. He draws attention to the dangers inherent in a mass exodus of unemployed from one country when they encounter the mass of unemployed in other countries.

The announcer reports that the draft decision was put to the vote. Only two more votes would have been needed for it to be passed. The reconciliation commission was again entrusted with preparing a new version of the document and to submit it at one of the following joint sessions. At this point the session's working day was completed. Tomorrow the chambers of the Supreme Soviet will meet separately.

The program then ends.

Law on State Security Bodies Adopted

LD1605125191 Moscow TASS in English 1215 GMT 16 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—The national parliament today adopted a law on state security bodies, defining their purpose, principles of operation, duties and rights, and a system for monitoring their activity.

The new law is the first unclassified act pertaining to state security in Soviet history. KGB activity has until

now been regulated by eight acts adopted by the Supreme Soviet and 800 pieces of government legislation, all classified.

Under the new law, KGB bodies must ensure the state security of the USSR and constituent republics within the framework of their competence.

Their job is to combat counter intelligence-gathering and subversion by foreign secret services and organisations against the USSR and individual republics, and to protect the constitution, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the state and its scientific, technological and defence potential.

Conducting intelligence and counter-intelligence operations, providing government bodies of the USSR and republics with diverse information, fighting terrorism and organised crime, securing the protection of state secrets, and guarding the state border are the main spheres of activity of state security bodies.

State security bodies base their activity on principles of legality, and on respect for individual rights and freedoms.

In keeping with provisions of the new law, citizens may appeal to the courts against unjustified actions by state security bodies and officials.

The law stipulates that state security officials "are not bound (in the performance of their official duties) by decisions of political parties and mass public movements pursuing political objectives."

The law takes into account the sovereignty of republics and their desire to have their own state security bodies. The KGB of the USSR and corresponding republican authorities form a united system of state security.

The KGB of the USSR is a Union-republican body that "directs, coordinates and controls" the activities of republican security bodies. Both the KGB of the USSR and corresponding republican authorities will perform functions within the framework of their competence.

A total of 352 parliamentarians voted in favour of the law, one vote was against and 10 deputies abstained.

KGB Chief Welcomes New State Security Law

LD1605161591 Moscow TASS in English 1603 GMT 16 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—KGB Chief Vladimir Kryuchkov today has described the adoption of a law on state security by the Soviet parliament today as a major step towards a law-governed state and the supremacy of law in the country.

In his address to the parliament he recalled that the State Security Committee (KGB) was among those who initiated the new law "because we want to live in accordance with law, in accordance with the truth, we want to keep pace with history, with the entire Soviet people, having resolutely discarded the burden of the insupportable, the tragic and the oppressive with which the history of our fatherland abounds".

Characterizing the present domestic political situation in the Soviet Union, Vladimir Kryuchkov said that "we are now facing a choice: either laws and the truth will prevail in this country, or violence, arbitrariness and humilation of man will dominate it for a long time to come".

"We already see situations of this kind in some parts of our country," Kryuchkov added.

The KGB chief drew the attention of deputies to the fact that the USSR "has now entered a crisis from which all its peoples and republics can emerge only together".

Kryuchkov stressed that the considerable power vested in the KGB by the law adopted today is "a very sharp weapon". "We shall use it only in legal ways and only when we run against counteraction," he said.

The KGB chief also said that the department he heads will defend Soviet values, "the chief among which is the single Union".

Supreme Soviet Fails To Pass Emigration Bill

LD1605164191 Moscow TASS in English 1607 GMT 16 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—The Soviet Supreme Soviet failed to pass an emigration bill for the third time. If passed, the bill will mark the first time that Soviet citizens will have the right to free movement in full compliance with international laws.

During stormy two-day debates on the bill this week, many deputies favoured delaying passing the bill because expenditures on its realisation may prove an unbearable burden for the crisis-hit economy. Apprehensions that the law would lead to massive "brain drain" and thus further exacerbate the situation have been also expressed.

On Monday May 13, the bill was approved by one chamber of the parliament, the Council of the Union, but failed to muster the required number of votes in the second chamber, the Council of Nationalities. As a result, it was decided to create a conciliation commission which presented a compromise variant.

The proposal envisaged adopting the law on the whole, but its article-by-article discussion was postponed until the resolution on putting the law into effect has been finalised. It was proposed that this should be done at the current session, but many deputies found the delay

inadmissible. As a result, no decision has been taken. The Supreme Soviet will resume debating the bill on Monday May 20.

Supreme Soviet Rejects Gorbachev Appointee

LD1605110391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0900 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Greetings, comrades. This bulletin is being presented by commentator Tatyana Nikolayeva. In our program today we have two legislative reports. The first is from the USSR Supreme Soviet session. Vladimir Perfilyev is on the line:

[Perfilyev] Good day. Today's morning session, a joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, took place under the chairmanship of Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov. A break has now been declared. Before the break, it was planned to examine the draft law on organs of state security and the draft law on the introduction of changes and additions to the USSR law on the procedure for resolving collective labor disputes.

As happens here at the session, things change. Vladimir Ivanovich Shcherbakov, who is now first deputy prime minister of the USSR, replied to questions from the members of the Supreme Soviet. He spoke about yesterday's session of the Cabinet of Ministers in which great interest was shown. There was an extremely large number of questions. We will discuss that later.

Now let me tell you that virtually all of the morning session was devoted to appointments. The Supreme Soviet gave its consent to representations from the USSR president. In particular, the Supreme Soviet gave its consent for Vladimir Ivanovich Shcherbakov, who was deputy prime minister, to be appointed first deputy prime minister of the USSR. He will also carry out the duties of minister of economy and forecasting of the USSR.

Nikolay Pavlovich Laverov, who is also a deputy prime minister, will also be chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology. Consent was given for (Abikhat Dzhavarakhimova) to be appointed USSR deputy prime minister. She will be in charge of social policy questions.

There was also a representation from the president for Stefan Aramaisovich Sitaryan to be appointed deputy prime minister, but the USSR Supreme Soviet did not give its consent for his appointment. There were very many reasons for that. I will cite only what was said by Deputy Kanarovskaya, who came out categorically against the fact that last year 700 million rubles worth of perfume was bought abroad while 50 percent of our light industry is now lying idle because of the absence of raw material. Of course, neither this speech nor this reason were why consent was withheld. There were many issues here. Evidently it will be necessary to return to this question once again.

Let me repeat that there is now a break in the session. With this I end my report from the Kremlin.

Orlov Appointed Head of Control Chamber

LD1605181191 Moscow TASS in English 1723 GMT 16 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—The national parliament today passed a law on state security bodies that outlines the designation, the principles of activity, responsibilities and rights of state security organs, as well as the system of control over their activity.

Under the law, the state security bodies ensure, within their terms of reference, state security of the USSR and wage struggle against intelligence and subversive activities of secret services of foreign states and organisations against the USSR and republics, provide protection of the constitutional system, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the state, its scientific, technological and defense potential.

It was established that the USSR State Security Committee and relevant bodies of the republics make up a single state security system. The USSR State Security Committee is a Union-republican body, which guides, coordinates and supervises the activity of state security bodies in republics.

Parliamentarians also passed a law on the USSR Control Chamber. Its status is defined as "the country's supreme body of financial and economic control, operating under the guidance of and subordinate to the USSR Supreme Soviet."

The Control Chamber will exercise control over fulfilment of the Union budget, use of the Union property, as well as sources and use of the revenues of all-Union mass associations.

Aleksandr Orlov, who was deputy chairman of the parliament's Planning, Budget and Financial Commission, was appointed chairman of the Control Chamber.

The parliament also considered nominations to the USSR cabinet of ministers. Bikhodzhal Rakhimova, 50, secretary of the Central Committee of Tajikistan's Communist Party, was endorsed as deputy prime minister, in charge of social policy issues.

Vladimir Shcherbakov, deputy prime minister since March this year, was appointed first deputy prime minister and concurrently minister of the economy and forecasting. Deputy Premier Academician Nikolay Laverov was appointed chairman of the USSR State Committee for science and technologies.

Deputies failed to pass the emigration bill which will be considered again on Monday, May 20.

Tomorrow as planned, members of parliament will have separate sittings of the chambers.

Political & Social

Further on Shcherbakov Cabinet Address

PM1605151091 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 16 May 91 p 1

[Aleksandr Borisov report on 15 May enlarged session of USSR Cabinet of Ministers: "The Anticrisis Program: To Be or Not To Be?"]

[Text] An enlarged sitting of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers was held yesterday in the Kremlin Oval Hall. The draft Program To Extricate the Country From the Economic Crisis was discussed. The very fact that the session was conducted by the USSR president and that the heads of government of the Union republics took part in it indicates the importance of the meeting and its orientation toward achieving unity between the republics and the center on this question.

Emergence from the crisis is possible only with the closest coordination of action between all organs of power. This point was perhaps the leitmotiv of the half-hour report by USSR Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov. He proposed that a course be set toward the rapid destatization of the country's industry, which should take place under the control of the republics and the center. Emergence from the crisis is possible only in the context of the preservation of a single economic space, which is by no means in conflict with the idea of statehood and respect for the republics' sovereignty. V. Shcherbakov also spoke about the need to attract foreign capital and about strengthening incentives, which would make it possible to boost labor productivity and extend consumer goods production. The outline for the implementation of anticrisis measures has been drawn up, he said, in thel light of the experience of former CEMA countries, Brazil, Singapore, and South Korea—and permits us to expect that it will be possible to stabilize the situation in the country by the middle of this year, and to achieve a certain growth in production by the end of the year.

The main objections from representatives of the republics who spoke in the debates amounted to the following. They welcome the idea of destatization, but want enterprises first to be transferred from Union to republic jurisdiction, and for the process of privatization to begin only after that. Shcherbakov objected that instead of a single center engaged in administration, we risk ending up with dozens of smaller centers, and then the transition to market relations will be excessively complicated.

However, the discussion in the Oval Hall was by no means merely a matter of futile debates and mutual complaints. Thus Ivan Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, stated that the joint work on the draft program has produced results. He welcomed the idea of a clear demarcation of the powers of the center and the republics, agreed that it is necessary to introduce a federal tax in the country, and called for the unnecessarily declarative tone and the inclination toward administrative levers of management to be removed from the document. Ivan Stepanovich also stressed that Russia counts on the center's help in implementing its economic program, which was approved by the republic parliament.

By all appearances, work on the draft program will continue for a few more days. It will then be issued for final implementation and signing. How successful will the latest package of anticrisis measures prove, and will the republic-center cooperation be long-term and close? These questions concern all citizens of the country today.

Pavlov, Shcherbakov Hold News Conference

LD1605221791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1628 GMT 16 May 91

[Report, with recorded excerpts on news conference given by USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov and USSR First Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov in Moscow on 15 May by unidentified correspondent]

[Text] Opening his news conference, which was devoted to the USSR Cabinet of Minister, and the sovereign republics' program to stabilize the economy and find a way out of the crisis, Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov warned journalists that he could only spare them one hour, and if he was unable to fully satisfy their interest, then the discussion would be taken up by his deputy, Vladimir Ivanovich Shcherbakov, who was endorsed today by the Supreme Soviet, also as minister of economy and forecasting. Therefore, the prime minister's preliminary statement was as brief as possible. We will carry just one fragment of it in this report:

[Pavlov] Events are developing very quickly and one of our main tasks—and this left its natural mark on the demands made of the program—is to act, and to act as quickly as possible.

We believe that there are no ideal solutions which can satisfy everyone, we make no claims to such a role, and therefore we are well aware that we will upset some people, we will not be able to fully satisfy some people. But the important thing as far as we are concerned is that there should be a long-term effect in the interests of the majority.

[Correspondent] Which republics yesterday proved to be the least compliant, and what were their arguments?

[Pavlov] As you know, the position of each of these republics is determined by its objective position in our common economic space today and within the framework of the division of labor, and, therefore, I would say not from the point of view of compliancy, but the most noncompliant in this sense were the two republics who simply did not take part in the work. These were Georgia and Estonia. In this sense they were the most noncompliant. However, it was the Ukraine, I would say, which expressed views which coincided least with those of the others on a number of issues.

[Correspondent] (?On the subject of the) emergency measures during the fulfillment of the anti-crisis program, what measures are proposed?

[Pavlov] Well, generally speaking, I do not see the need to employ any emergency measures today. We have come to the conclusion that we will introduce, can we put it this way, special working conditions in a number of industries aimed at stabilizing their work and restoring the volume of output.

[NOVOSTI correspondent] Can you, bearing in mind the present critical and crisis situation in the country, confirm a rather optimistic promise which you made that shop shelves will be filled by the middle of the year? Will people feel that there is a considerably better choice on shop shelves? Sorry, by October... I am being prompted here.

[Pavlov] You know there is a great distance [between the words] "filled" and "feel", let us be clear. The point is that we, among the Cabinet members, analyzed the situation a long time ago and we know precisely what has caused our present crisis. First, a crisis of goods. If we are talking about non-foodstuffs, I can tell you definitely that one of the most important reasons is that last year we should have worked mainly at regulating our balance of payments first and should not have made a tragedy out of it, bearing in mind that our manufacturers of non-foodstuffs are connected very rigidly with supplies from the external market. This is not any kind of tragedy or mistake. This is normal. Everybody is specializing in the area where he, generally, is technologically, or by any other principle, most adept. In this exclusively civilian sphere we have been orienting ourselves for a long time toward cooperation with the world market and Western partners. In the process of arranging our international participation in the division of labor from the point of view of what we need from Western markets, we have somewhat, let us say, fallen behind, from the point of view of gearing ourselves to what we need from Western markets. So in this connection we have based ourselves on an essentially weak foundation; I mean that there was a very strong dependency on the export of hydrocarbons and this, in principle, has failed us.

In this sense I both considered and consider that no tragedy should be made out of this. Measures should simply have been taken and a fundamental agreement reached with the partners that there is indeed a mistake, there are shortcomings. They must be eliminated, and eliminated in the interests of both sides. We must sit down and come to agreement. This needs some period of time. So, agreement has to be reached on the time. What is new here in global practice? If you take a loan from your neighbor and then can't manage to pay in advance, you say, give me time until I receive payment. This is a normal phenomenon, that is, no one is refused or refuses to pay either the main debt or the interest.

[Correspondent Terekhov from INTERFAX] INTERFAX, Terekhov. I have one question each to the prime minister and the first deputy; as I said, one each. Valentin Sergeyevich, in your introductory remarks, you said that you will take account of the actual progress of events every day. Does this constitute a readiness to follow events, instead of controlling them from a previously prepared standpoint?

And a question for Vladimir Ivanovich. Having taken up the new post of the country's main economic planner and economist, as it were, if one accepts the fact that the premier answers in general for the whole country, how will you get out of the following situation—the republics' demand for a division of property? the Cabinet of Ministers and—judging by yesterday's sitting—the president are not very inclined to divide property. This is the first problem which will confront you. How do you intend to resolve it?

[Pavlov] You have to marvel at Terekhov's resourcefulness once again. He has managed to ask two questions all the same! Well, you see how it is. We are proceeding nonetheless from the thesis that any plan cannot be a dogma, because then it binds you hand and foot. Life goes its own way, but you, excuse me, only see the plan in front of you. If we have once had the sense to reject harsh directive planning, why should we approach the restructuring program, above all the restructuring of the country's economic mechanism, in a directive way, as it were? Well, and when we say that we will, let's put it this way, look dynamically at this program, then, after all we mean that life itself will present much that is new in this aspect. I can cite this simple example to you, which cropped up today. We agreed yesterday that, yes, we will hand over, let's say, questions of the licensing of a significant portion of output for export to the jurisdiction of the Union republics. This right will concern that output which is not subject to import restrictions from the point of view of the world market, and will include rights within the framework of subquotas which will transpire from the decisions of the Union republic hard currency committee on the partitioning of the total Union quota. Well, lets take the example of mineral fertilizer exports. The USSR quota is 6 million tonnes. Well, we are going to divide it between the republics. How are we going to divide it? This is another matter. The Union-republican committee is going to decide in one way or another. While within the framework of this, of these subquotas, the Union republics are going to act on their own. They are going to issue licences. That

means in short, deciding whether the Lisichanskiy chemical combine is going to export, say, mineral fertilizers, or some other one.

However, the question arises today whether it is sensible to act in this way alone? It turns out that a simple question is already arising today. Someone says: We are going to export to China as part of the quota, but do we need to take mineral fertilizers from the Ukraine to China if we also have an enterprise producing them in navoi [Uzbekistan]? Maybe, republics will exchange export quotas? Is this option possible? Well, it probably is, because it is a sensible solution and does not raise any doubts in anybody. So, we agreed today, in addition or as an amendment to yesterday's agreements, that we will take this joint decision that this production need not necessarily be licenced according to quotas, but a kind of a market, or an exchange of export quotas may be set up.

[Correspondent] Does your program involve another wave of price increases for essential commodities? And, whom do you, as a Russian citizen, support in the elections for the president of Russia? Thank you.

[Pavlov] The issue of the price levels will depend on two things, you see. The first and most important one is the question of restoring volumes of production, first and foremost, in the consumer sector. This is a central issue which the level of prices is going to depend on. And I can tell you that, you know, if we manage to restore the volume of consumer goods production sufficiently quickly, then I am almost 100 percent sure that prices will start to fall. Because today they reflect a production level of some 105-108 percent of the year 1990. While in fact the reality is, for instance, that meat production has today fallen by 14 percent, I think, milk by 16 percent, and so on. Clearly, stagflation is stagflation, and you cannot avoid it. So the price today is, in actual fact, at a level where it has nowhere to rise to, because, if it were to rise any further it would become meaningless. So, this is the key. Therefore the whole future program is aimed at increasing production, because it proceeds from the fact that the level of prices today in prinicple allows production to be increased with costs in effect covered [prakticheski po zamykayvshchirn zatratum]. As for the Russian citizen, I also think that there is nothing to hide here. I will nevertheless vote for Ryzhkov, although I know in advance that—I'll say this once again—I think that I will be in the minority. But personal liking also comes into it, as it were.

[Correspondent from ZHIZN] I have a question—ZHIZN newspaper. The NEP era [new economic policy in the early 1920s] was a flourishing era, this is generally recognized by everyone, and is considered a classic. The question is: What are we doing wrong now? And why can't we in fact reach a flowering? A second question: I would like to ask you what your economic evaluation of the action implemented to replace bank notes is? The idea was to strike a powerful blow at the mafia. Thank you.

[Pavlov] As you know, a flourishing era in any society, in any state, is always based on certain economic preconditions and resources. It is important in this case that the mechanism of production relations makes these resources work. If it corresponds to the possibilities and opens up a space for the development of production forces, then you will get a flowering. This is why saying that NEP was a classic is a mistake. NEP was a classic for those production forces and for those initial preconditions which existed at that time. This is why we must build a mechanism for switching to the market and forming a market which will correspond to our real, economic, and sociopolitical conditions.

As regards the exchange of money, this is a question which has become so routine, I can tell you only one thing: In principle we withdrew a fairly large sum of money. I can't remember exactly, I think it's about 13 billion.

[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA correspondent] SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, (?Zhirkov). Esteemed Valentin Sergeyevich, Moscow is buzzing with rumors about probable operations in connection with bank notes. According to press reports, such a panic broke out in the Ukraine a few days ago.

[Pavlov] Under conditions of general instability, unfortunately, a psychological unsteadiness occurs among the great mass of the people, and people are subject to this. Clearly, this psychology of the masses, so to speak, has not yet been properly studied in our country. In principle, however, this psychology dictates, so to speak, and panic approaches. Well, somebody says something—this is the general principle. Of course, this is absolute nonsense, rubbish, it cannot be, but, to hell with it, let us go along with it just in case, and I will, too.

What can I say? How can I refute what, in my view, simply does not even warrant serious discussion because rumors are rumors. Just like a butterfly or a moth it has to live through the day and by the evening it is dead. The whole thing boils down to the fact that it is not worth the time spent on it because however much you try to convince someone that this cannot be, if he stubbornly, with glassy eyes, cannot see and will not hear what you tell him, then all your words are simply an empty waste of time. He has to run up against a wall and convince himself that it is nonsense. Well, let us wait and see.

Please excuse me now, thank you for your attention, but I have overstayed my time limit. I will now leave you with Vladimir Ivanovich.

[Shcherbakov] We thank Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov and we will continue our news conference.

[Pavlov] Goodbye.

[Unidentified speaker] Second row, please.

[MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS correspondent] MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS (?Zarib). Vladimir

Ivanovich, first question: Do you connect the issues of exit and entry with the issue of our country getting credits?

[Shcherbakov] I do not connect the law on exit and entry—which is more to do with exit, because there are not many people wishing to enter our country at the present moment—with the issue of getting credits. Unfortunately, the United States is connecting these two issues. That is why the question should be addressed not to me but to the other side. They treat what is happening in our country with understanding and they see that the issue has come to a stop for some time not because of political motives, as happened before, but for economic reasons we are not able, as it were, to fulfill this law. Besides, I said at one of the news conferences here that a very large international meeting took place in Vienna a month or two ago. It was specially devoted to the issue of exit from the USSR and countries of Eastern Europe. I represented the USSR there as minister of labor. All the countries that took part in the meeting,—38 countries took part, including the whole of Europe, Australia, Israel, the United States, Canada—in the absolute majority of cases the ministers of internal affairs, of labor, the deputy ministers appealed to us not to hurry in adopting this law. The countries are asking us to give them time to think how this may affect them. The whole of Europe is alarmed by rumors of 20 million hungry, ill-clad Russians invading Europe and the invasion of the Huns would be considered chicken feed compared with this invasion. We also understand this. We are conducting talks now, at least, we have got down to a practical implementation. A decision has been taken to create a state service on migration affairs in the USSR. Such a service is being set up at the moment, and as far as I know there has been a meeting here with the head of the service.

Organizational measures have been taken. The law in this case is not holding us back very much, I want you to understand this because the Soviet people already have the right today to leave the country to work abroad after the adoption of the law on occupation. A special paragraph is devoted to this. I cannot recall the number of the paragraph. As for the law on exit and entry: It deals with the technical aspects of exit, which have been simplified.

[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI CORRESPONDENT] Gurevich, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI. The prime minister revealed in a few words here that a special regime will be introduced in certain branches of the economy but he did not explain the essence of such a regime. The first question is whether it is simply about the priority of supplies or is it about the mutual responsibilities of the enterprises?

The second question: I think I read recently in THE NEW YORK TIMES that Prime Minister Pavlov said that Gorbachev has signed a decree on a moratorium on strikes in certain branches of the industry and that the initiators of such strikes will be punished by administrative measures. Is this so and will this be brought in?

[Shcherbakov] First it was proposed, particulary in the nine-plus-one statement, that special working conditions would be introduced in a number of industries, and in the first place it was intended to offer these industries the chance to work normally in conditions of high instability in all areas of the national economy because very wide ripples have passed deep into the base industries. For example stoppages in the chemical industry caused major stoppages throughout the whole of the rest of industry, especially light industry. In essence we badly wrecked all our plans in the area of chemical fertilizer production, and so on and so forth. This has had very far-reaching consequences. This is why we, including me, prepared a decree to develop this. The essence of this decree consists of several points. First, it is necessary to give these industries normal supplies because we put them in an unequal and disadvantageous position. We fixed the prices of their products and allowed the possibility of products being supplied to them at free prices. As a result their profitability fell sharply, difficulties arose, and they cannot engage in their activities on the principles of self-financing. Either we have to give them subsidies or take other measures. We took a market oriented decision. We said: sell 10 percent of all your products, since they are in shortest supply, to whoever you wish, at any price. It can be at home, it can be abroad, so to speak—it is up to you.

Second, measures have been taken to provide incentives to the workers themselves. We said: For every percentage increase in the average daily tempo in January and April, that is the most difficult times, we will increase the consumption fund by 5 percent. This means that if instead of today's average 10 percent decrease, you increase production volume by 10 percent, your wages can increase by 50 percent.

A number of other such things also follow including the increased responsibility of these branches for supplies. This also includes the increased responsibility of the people who hamper the normal work of these branches. Hence the embargo imposed on the strikes in these branches of industry for the period till the end of this year. The local authorities and the executive organizations at all levels including the Ministry of Internal Affairs are instructed to put a resolute stop to all these activities without giving them a chance to develop further, to prevent tensions building up. If the organizers of such provocative actions demonstrate increased activity they should be made to face the administrative and material responsibility if they do not qualify under the articles of the criminal code. If they do, then the measures envisaged by the criminal code should be applied. This is the heart of the matter. Regarding the statement by Pavlov, I did not have time to read THE NEW YORK TIMES but he probably meant the same thing as I am saying now. Such a decree has indeed been signed. It was not released until it had been discussed by the Cabinet. I hope it will come out in the nearest future because the country needs it.

[IZVESTIYA correspondent] IZVESTIYA. We have already learned how to write programs. We have seen several of them in the past two-three years. We would like to hear about the mechanism for implementing it. Please try to explain this as clearly as possible. Is there a conviction that the current program will not meet the fate of the previous ones?

[Shcherbakov] I will begin with the first part of your question. Indeed, we have learned to write them [programs], and you in IZVESTIYA to describe them beforehand without reading the program. Therefore, we have acquired mutual experience here, including one on the personal level. As for the mechanism of this program, I believe the best assurance for the realistic outcome of this program is that it is a joint program by all the governments and all of them will accept it by equally signing it. This I believe to be the most important foundation. There are, of course, many mechanisms there, new approaches, but this is the most important thing. People do not fulfill [programs] when they are convinced that they should be doing things differently. In that instance the orders or suggestions coming from the center are received as a command, as coercion. Hence the immediate rise in self-consciousness and soverignty, and the need to find out who is who.

The result is that this transition to such kitchen language as you might call it blocks all action. We think that since we have agreed in principle, agreed on the demarcation of functions in carrying out the program, there is consequently no need to seek each other out to coordinate and link everything and engender mutual irresponsibility, because coordination usually results in a document for which no one accepts responsibility. We have agreed on the functions, someone will be personally responsible for each point and each measure, and we will get down to work.

[Correspondent] Thank you.

[Shcherbakov] You are welcome.

[Correspondent in English with superimposed Russian translation] Next week, there is to be a strike of air traffic controllers, and the pilots are also threatening to hold a strike. What is the government's position on this issue?

[Shcherbakov] I will take advantage of the fact that journalists are here. I want to warn everyone and, with your help, the air traffic controllers and the pilots of the Vnukovo enterprise that, in accordance with the law on strikes and the law on labor disputes, strikes in these areas are banned by law. The strike will immediately be declared illegal, and we will apply the law, in this case, in full measure, including the president's new decree on strike organizers.

[THE TIMES correspondent in English with superimposed Russian translation] THE TIMES newspaper, London. In the section of your speech, which was heard on television last night, you said that there would be a need for big cuts in the second half of this year in three sectors: capital construction, defense and administrative [word indistinct] Can you say how you propose to make the cuts in defense spending, given the [word indistinct] resistance of the military to cutting even to [word indistinct] of the spending before the beginning of this year?

[Shcherbakov] Let me mull over the first question at my ministry, because when I came I said to my colleagues that the state plan is old, the military-industrial complex has always loomed large in it, and civilian engineering has taken second place. I told them that I will fuse these two complexes and in such a form I consider the future existence of the plan system to be impossible. The defense complex cannot occupy an oasis while the whole country is in a different situation. I have, as it were, experienced in full measure, and now know well enough who has an interest in this matter. So I do not want to answer you question as to how I will make the cuts, not because I cannot, but because I do not want to whip up this issue further.

We will reduce expenditure on the military-industrial complex, in the first place, at the expense of reducing time on conversion and at the expense of attracting foreign capital for conversion and opening a considerable number of defense enterprises to convert them into joint-stock companies and consortiums of various types with the participation of foreign capital. We will do this. As for reducing expenditure on administration, we will reduce a considerable part of the central apparatus of ministries and the number of ministries. I have been appointed chairman of the commission for considering these questions at a Union level. We have set ourselves a task to reduce total budget expenditure on supporting the administrative apparatus by 30 percent as minimum now. We have applied with the same proposal to the Supreme Soviet. It is high time to consider what we are spending on supporting our democratic deputies' organizations. Now every settlement soviet deputy has acquired a lawyer as an aid for 350 rubles to do their work for them and are receiving the wages themselves. I think that the period of euphoria has passed. We suggest that all this money is collected together and sent to increase pensions for old people. I would like to observe deputies' reaction to this formulation.

[Unidentified speaker] Any more questions, please?

[Shcherbakov] Is that all?

[Unidentified speaker] Thank you very much.

[Shcherbakov] Thank you for your attention.

Pavlov Backs Ryzhkov for RSFSR Presidency

LD1605180491 Moscow TASS in English 1721 GMT 16 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—Valentin Pavlov was sceptical about the idea of dividing the Soviet Union's

common hard currency indebtedness among republics. An agreement to that effect was reached at the Cabinet's meeting on Wednesday.

"The only plausible [as received] are averaging approaches to the solution of this problem with account taken of economic, labour and natural potentials and hard currency incomes, but all of them are vulnerable to criticism," he stressed. "Nevertheless, once this decision has been adopted, the government will seek to implement it".

Valentin Pavlov said that he would vote for former Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov for Russian president on June 12, although he believes he will find himself in a minority: "Boris Yeltsin's chances of winning are much higher".

"Seeking to explain the Cabinet's reasons for the rouble swap earlier this year, when 50- and 100-rouble bills were withdrawn from circulation provoking popular discontent and baffling professionals, Valentin Pavlov re-affirmed his conviction that "the money exchange yielded positive results".

According to Pavlov, 13 billion roubles were withdrawn from circulation and the main directions of the shadow capital flows were brought to light.

Valentin Pavlov and his first deputy Vladimir Shcherbakov expressed their sceptical attitude toward the interview with Grigoriy Yavlinsky published in the latest issue of the MOSCOW NEWS weekly. The economic celebrity said in the interview that the G-7 countries intended issuing new credits to the Soviet Union on condition that the programme on which he was now working jointly with G-7 experts was adopted.

Vladimir Shcherbakov added that the statement in the interview that Yavlinskiy held the single initiator of cooperation with G-7 and a shareholder in that process was inconsistent with reality and was prompted by sensation-mongering. However, he praised Yavlinsky for his ability to find a channel of unofficial communication with those in the United States who support the idea of helping the Soviet Union.

"However talks should proceed through official channels," the deputy prime minister stressed. "The president of the USSR spoke on the subject with the presidents of the United States and France and discussed the project in Japan. Myself and presidential adviser Yevgeniy Primakov have been entrusted with a mission in the United States aimed at conducting relevant negotiations".

Vladimir Shcherbakov said the Cabinet was determined to considerably cut allocations to the military-industrial complex "at the expense of reducing the conversion schedule, declassifying a considerable number of defence enterprises and turning them into joint stock societies and consortiums with the participation of foreign capital".

"Spending on the management apparatus must also be reduced by at least 30 per cent," he added.

Speaking about the strike called for May 21 by Soviet pilots and air traffic controllers, the deputy prime minister warned that the strike would be immediately declared illegal and "relevant measures" will be taken against its organisers.

Gorbachev Decree To Ensure Stability in Sectors

LD1605192991 Moscow TASS in English 1911 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—"The situation calls for special measures," President Michael Gorbachev notes in his decree on measures to ensure stable work of the key sectors of the economy, including energy, coal, oil and gas, chemical and petrochemical industries, metallurgy and railways.

Pointing out that the national economy is in a critical state, the national income has dwindled by 10 per cent and the disruption of economic ties threatens a stoppage of thousands of enterprises, which will have to lay off millions of people, the president ordered the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of Soviet republics to give top priority to ensuring economic conditions and labour and production incentives for key sectors in the current year. These enterprises will be allowed to independently sell up to 10 per cent of their products on the domestic market at contract prices or export them (after fulfilling obligatory export sales) under licenses.

The ministries of the key sectors are obliged to ensure the unconditional fulfillment of decisions concerning a considerable growth of pay to workers in these sectors in line with the results of their labour.

The president decreed to spread to all enterprises of the coal, oil, gas, chemical and petrochemical industries and metallurgy the effect of Article 11 of the law of the USSR on the procedure for the settlement of collective labour disputes (conflicts) which bans stoppages of work as a means of settling a labour dispute (conflict).

The president established that persons disorganizing production or violating public order on the premises of enterprises could face administrative prosecution under the law, unless the nature of their actions entails criminal responsibility.

Text of Decree

CM1705085191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 May 91 Second Edition p 2

["USSR Presidential Decree on Urgent Measures To Ensure the Stable Working of Fundamental Sectors of the National Economy"]

[Text] The USSR president today signed a decree on urgent measures to ensure the stable functioning of the basic branches of the national economy. [It reads:]

The national economy is in a critical state. Production is dropping. National income has already gone down by 10 percent. The destruction of economic relations presents a real threat that thousands of enterprises will be brought to a halt. Millions of people could lose their jobs.

The situation requires special actions, particularly in the basic industries, on which the normal functioning of all enterprises depends.

Guided by the program for bringing the economy out of crisis, which was supported by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the 23 April joint statement of the USSR president and the most senior officials of the republics, I decree as follows:

1. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of the republics are to adopt immediate measures to ensure the uninterrupted functioning of electric power and the coal, oil, gas, chemical, and oil refining industries, metallurgy, and railway transport.

Priority conditions of economic management and labor and production incentives are to be applied to enterprises of the afore mentioned industries during 1991. The accountability, including material accountability, of enterprise workers for meeting state orders and economic contracts and for violation of labor and production discipline should at the same time be stepped up.

2. Enterprises in basic industries should be granted the right independently to market up to 10 percent of their output on the domestic market at contractual prices—the exact percentage to be fixed by the republican governments—or to export under licence according to established procedure, so long as they have met compulsory export deliveries.

3. In order to restore and increase production volumes in the oil, gas, chemical, oil refining, and metallurgical industries, it should be stipulated by way of an extraordinary measure for 1991, that for every percentage of increase in output over and above the average daily output for the January-April period this year, the monthly consumption fund at enterprises of these industries is to increase by five percent. The profit left at the disposal of enterprises is to be used for this purpose, and should that not suffice, contributions to budgets are to be reduced.

The USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification, the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry, and the USSR Ministry of Railways should ensure the unconditional fulfilment of the decisions adopted for 1991, providing for a substantial increase in the wages of workers of these industries, tied to the results of their labor.

4. The local soviets of people's deputies, their executive, and administrative bodies should ensure comprehensive assistance to the work of enterprises of the basic industries by not permitting unlawful interference in their activity.

They should determine that disputes between enterprises, as well as between enterprises and administrative bodies at all levels, are investigated by the USSR higher court of arbitration, and the appropriate arbitration bodies of the union republics.

5. It must be recognized that it is necessary to introduce certain measures of special working conditions in industries indicated in Article 1 of the present decree for 1991. It is necessary to extend the effect of Article 11 of the USSR law on the procedure for resolving collective labor disputes and conflicts, and not permitting the cessation of work as a means of resolving a labor dispute or conflict, to all the enterprises of the coal, oil, gas, chemical, and oil refining industry, and metallurgy.

It is to be specified that persons obstructing production or violating public order on the territory of enterprises—in accordance with legislation—are to be made liable under administrative law and held financially liable if their actions do not entail criminal responsibility.

6. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of the union republics are to make a decision within two weeks ensuring the practical implementation of this decree, and also to prepare for submission to the USSR Supreme Soviet proposals on introducing into USSR legislative acts amendments and addenda which are necessary to ensure a special working regime.

7. This decree is effective from the moment of its publication.

[Signed] USSR President M. Gorbachev, Kremlin, Moscow, 16 May 1991

Trade Union Leader Rejects Decree

LD1705121391 Moscow TASS in English 1204 GMT 17 May 91

[By TASS corrspondent Igor Agabekov]

[Text] Moscow May 17 TASS—The Russian Federation of Independent Trade Unions rejects President Mikhail Gorbachev's decree banning strikes in crucial economic sectors, its chairman Igor Klochkov told a news conference here today.

The decree, issued on Thursday, specified "urgent measures to ensure stable operations by basic economic branches".

Klochkov commented: "We shall not leave this presidential move without attention. We do not accept such measures."

"No bans can cure an illness. They can only drive it deeper inside an organism," he said.

Gorbachev Submits Ministerial Candidates

OW1705043791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] President Gorbachev has submitted proposals to the national parliament on new appointments to the Soviet Cabinet.

He suggested appointing Vladmimir Shcherbakov (born 1949) the first deputy premier, the minister of economy and forecasting. The doctor of economics has been deputy prime minister since March 1991.

The president also suggested appointing Nikolay Laverov (b. 1930) to the post of deputy prime minister and simultaneously the chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology. Laverov is a mining engineer and geologist by training, a member of the Academy of Sciences, since last January deputy prime minister.

The other proposed deputy prime minister is Bikhojal Rakhimova, a secretary of the Central Committee of the Tajik Communist Party.

Finally, one more presidential candidate to the post of deputy prime minister: Stepan Sitoryan, 61, a member of the Academy of Sciences, deputy prime minister in the Ryzhkov cabinet and chairman of the State Commission for Foreign Economic Relations.

Ignatenko Denies Rumors on Gorbachev House

LD1605152491 Moscow TASS in English 1459 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—Soviet presidential spokesman Vitaly Ignatenko blasted recent rumours and press publications alleging that the president's summer house being built near Pitsunda on the Black Sea coast is extremely luxurious.

Some publications, including the KOLHURI DIADEMA newspaper of the Georgian branch of the Abkhazian writers' union, have carried stories about the fabulous size and sumptuous interior decoration of the president's summer residence.

Here are a few of the pearls the newspaper offered its readers: "a ten-meter rich chandelier hangs down from the ceiling," "the swimming pool resembles a medium-sized violet lake." The newspaper also cited a sum of money which was allotted from the budget of the Georgian Republic to build the president's residence—100 million roubles.

Vitaly Ignatenko told TASS that all the "facts" cited by this newspaper as well as rumours about the use of gold and precious metals and stones in the decoration of the president's residence are pure invention.

Civil Flight Personnel To Join Strike

LD1705132491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 17 May 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The All-Union Association of Civil Aviation Flight Personnel has joined the air traffic controllers and has also declared a strike on 21 May. The pilots' demands are also exclusively economic. So far, only the air traffic controllers in Armenia have rejected the strike call.

Planned Air Controller Strike Viewed

LD1705082791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0500 GMT 17 May 91

[Text] A unionwide strike by pilots and air traffic controllers has been scheduled for 21 May. More than 90 percent of the country's air traffic controllers have agreed to take part. The USSR procurator general, however, has protested to the Ministry of Justice against the ministry's decision to register the federation of trade unions of air traffic controllers. In the procuracy's view, the article of the rules stipulating strikes by air traffic controllers contradicts USSR legislation.

One cannot fail to mention, at the same time, that the numerous appeals by air traffic controllers over many years to all possible institutions have yielded little result, although they spoke not so much about their own interests as about the lives of passengers, for a tired air traffic controller is the most dangerous thing to planes in the air.

As regards the forthcoming strike, it is absolutely obvious that a compromise or concessions from one of the sides are required, says today's KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. It adds that in the near future a proposal to satisfy the main demands made by air traffic controllers will be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet for discussion. These include a 36-hour week, annual leave of no less than 48 days, and retirement at the age of 50. Who knows, maybe this is a step toward solving the problem and averting the strike.

Supreme Soviet Passes Law on KGB

OW1705084991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1830 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet has passed a law on the national security services. Under it, the KGB will engage in intelligence, counterintelligence, organized crime combatting, etc. There will be KGB structure at both the national and republican levels.

The USSR KGB will control some of the Armed Forces, including the borderguards, the forces in charge of government communications, and the military counterintelligence. The law does not permit subordination of any Armed Forces to the republican KGBs.

The latter will, among other things, conduct intelligence and counterintelligence in the interests of the republics and the Union as a whole, and safeguard the security of economic and other facilities of republican importance.

The KGB will have the right to check postal messages and telephone and other communications without requesting permission from the Procurator's Office.

Politburo's Semenova Holds News Conference

PM1605132191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[Report by unnamed "our correspondent": "Women and Politics"]

[Text] This combination of words is now becoming increasingly persistent. It was heard repeatedly yesterday at the news conference held for Soviet and foreign journalists by G.V. Semenova, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and member of the Central Committee.

The talk was intelligent, full, and very useful for those who believe that the present difficult times are not conducive to such topics. The news conference presenter made a very well argued attempt to persuade those assembled of the need to open wide to women the doors into politics.

Exactly a month ago a Central Committee resolution was adopted "on the basic avenues of the CPSU's work with women and women's organizations"—a document which fundamentally turns the helm of our common ship "from woman toward woman."

The news conference discussed this and other steps which the country is taking in this direction and the underwater rocks and visible reefs for women entering politics.

The questions put to the presenter were very acute and wide-ranging and were of those it is hard to answer. Let us note that not one of them received a general or phony answer.

Kalugin U.S. Newspaper Interview Appraised

91UF0738A Moscow TRUD in Russian 14 May 91 p 3

[Article by TRUD correspondent V. Sisnev: "A Word Spoken Is Past Recalling..."]

[Text] Washington, May—Former KGB Major General O. Kalugin, who arrived in the United States together with other Soviet parliamentarians to participate in an international conference in Baltimore, gave an interview to Bill Gertz a correspondent of the WASHINGTON TIMES newspaper.

In principle, O. Kalugin repeated that which he has repeatedly said about the KGB previously—at home and abroad: It is a "centralized intelligence and counterintelligence institution, numbering from 250,000 to half a million employees;" "it has not changed one iota" during the years of perestroyka, and it remains a "tool of the CPSU," etc.

It is entirely possible that this is more apparent to yesterday's general. Just as his own services in a 33-year career in the KGB are apparent, and especially the 12 years spent in the United States, where, as O. Kalugin disclosed to B. Gertz, he was a "good spy." Something quite different prompted me to react to this interview. Because it was not he, but I who had to respond to questions by American journalists on 7 May, a publishing day of THE WASHINGTON TIMES, at a reception in our embassy on the occasion of Press Day. "Do you not realize that each of us will think twice now before writing something positive about Soviet policy? Even if it deserves it?" Or this kind of a question: "It is interesting how Moscow journalists would react if a former CIA station chief declared publicly that many of them in their time were in his pay and were pushing disinformation into the Soviet press that was necessary to him?" All of this was said in a joking and ironic tone, but, as it seems to me, rather seriously.

But this is the problem. Not limiting himself to the usual enumeration of his successes, the former station chief informed Gertz that he at that time succeeded in recruiting a number of his colleagues also, of course, not from the most influential organs of information. "The general," writes Gertz, "said that the KGB paid them, and they helped spread disinformation through their newspapers." However, he refused to give the names of his "helpers," adding that a more detailed narrative on this subject will be contained in his memoirs, which will soon be published in the Soviet Union and abroad. As I understand it, the names of the paid misinformers are not there either. But, perhaps, it would be better if they were—at least a shadow would not be cast on all of the other journalists. But, after all, now of course any one of them will think twice before writing anything good about Russians: Or someone might get the idea that he is on the payroll of some new Kalugin...

TASS Reviews Press for 17 May

LD1705061791 Moscow TASS in English 0612 GMT 17 May 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 17 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev presided over the meeting of Cabinet and republican leaders, who gathered on May 15 in the Kremlin to discuss a crisis programme, today's newspapers report.

The programme relies on market methods to pull the economy out of crisis, TRUD writes.

The measures were developed jointly by republics and central authorities and stand good chances of being implemented, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA comments.

Newspapers highlight Chinese Communist Party leader Jiang Zemin's visit to Moscow.

Gorbachev met Zemin to discuss bilateral cooperation and ways to expand it, PRAVDA reports.

Zemin also met Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov and Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, as well as activists of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society and public representatives.

Newspapers publish President Mikhail Gorbachev's decree "On urgent measures to ensure stability in basic industries".

The Soviet parliament met on Thursday to appoint new Cabinet members, PRAVDA reports.

Russian President Boris Yeltsin spoke in the Russian parliament about his visit to Czechoslovakia, it says.

"Russia has the right to independent international contacts, most of which it will pursue independently from the centre," Yeltsin said in what PRAVDA describes as his foreign policy programme.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA publish features about Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Ryzhkov's decency alone can prevent him from winning the race for the Russian Presidency, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA writes.

TRUD writes about the situation in South Ossetia.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes about farming in northern Caucasus.

PRAVDA writes about a constitutional crisis in Yugoslavia, where Croatia's Stipe Mesic failed to win election to the federal presidency.

PRAVDA carries an interview with deputy head of the U.S. Center of Defense Information James Bush, who comments on security issues and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States.

The newspaper comments on parliamentary elections in India.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA carries comments by Soviet General Staff Centre of Strategic-Tactical Research chief Lieutenant General S. Bogdanov on Operation Desert Storm.

The Gulf War will not have a negative effect on the Soviet arms cuts, but will force the Soviet Union to take a more cautious approach to weapons reductions, Bogdanov said.

Economic

Gosbank To Introduce New Ruble Banknotes

LD1605144691 Moscow TASS in English 1350 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—The Soviet Union introduces new five-ruble notes as of June 1. According to the USSR State Bank (Gosbank) announcement, they will be called banknotes of the USSR Gosbank with the denomination of 5 rubles, issue 1991. The description of the banknotes will be published in the press, the announcement points out.

Former five-ruble notes that were called state treasury notes with the denomination of 5 rubles, issue 1961, will remain in circulation until worn out.

USSR Gosbank also announced preparations to issue in the third and fourth quarters of this year banknotes of USSR Gosbank with the denomination of 1, 3, 10 and 25 rubles, issue 1991. Description of these banknotes and specific date of issuance will be reported additionally. Former 1961 notes, denominated 1, 3, 10 and 25 rubles, will remain in circulation until worn out and have to be accepted in any type of payment and account crediting.

Republics Demand Information on Foreign Debt

OW1505144591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1804 GMT 14 May 91

[From the "Business Today"]

[Text] The Soviet republics will be insisting on a clear definition of the expenditure they are expected to spend on paying off the foreign debt of the Soviet Union and are intending to demand a share in the division of the gold and diamond reserves of the country. During the discussion of the anti-crisis program of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Soviet Union, in which thirteen of the fifteen republics are taking part (all apart from Georgia and Estonia), the debt problem became one of the main bones of contention.

The chairman of the Ukrainian parliament emphasised that Western banks will not enter into busines cooperation with republican governments as they "do not know what they have at their disposal".

The republics are also insisting that the debt burden of the Soviet Union be shared out: Each republic wants to know the share of the debt which is to fall to its part.

According to official figures, the Soviet Union will have to pay $12 billion in 1991.

After stormy discussions at the meeting of the republics which on May 14 is to ratify the final version of the anticrisis program, it was decided to create an intergovernmental committee on agreements. This is to formulate no later than June 1, 1991 the principles for dividing the internal and external debt of the Soviet

Union, the indebtedness of other countries to the Soviet Union, and also the gold and diamond reserves between the center and the republics.

The meeting, the results of which will be discussed in the Soviet Cabinet of Ministers of May 15, also took the decision to sign in the second quarter of 1991 a Soviet Republican agreement on the general principles and limitation of privatisation functions.

Officials Agree on Anticrisis Economic Measures

OW1505180291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2105 GMT 14 May 91

[Text] Government officials from 13 Soviet republics (except Georgia and Estonia) concluded near Moscow on Tuesday a conference that yielded a draft program of anti-crisis action to be taken jointly by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the republican governments during the nation's transition to market practices. The conference agreed on a set of practical measures to see the program through, and discussed a number of Cabinet resolutions aimed at protecting the most vulnerable sections of the population against the effects of the recent price rises.

The officials considered a draft presidential decree scrapping the 5-percent sales tax on day-to-day goods, a move insisted upon by the signatories of the "Statement of Ten" (the USSR President and the leaders of nine republics).

IF's [INTERFAX] Vyacheslav Terekhov reports as the program of joint action was being finalized, a controversy flared up over the passage of goods through a number of regions and republics. Deputy Premier of the USSR Vladimir Sherbakov and his RSFSR opposite number Aleksander Kamenev called to immediately cancel the administrative resolutions impeding goods passage," but met with vigorous protests from representatives of practically all the other republics. The latter demanded that the program include a provision on the free passage of only those goods delivered under state orders and inter—republican agreements.

The delegation of Uzbekistan expressed in written form its protest against denationalizing state—run industrial enterprises.

Structure for Market Transition Discussed

914A0743A Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK in Russian No 16, Apr 91 p 3

[Interview with Ye. Arefyev, first deputy chief of a section of the state commission on economic reform, by PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK correspondent V. Lvov; place and date not given: "Levers of Administration"]

[Text] **As can be seen from a list being published, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers consists of 37 ministries and 10 Union state committees. This is less than in 1984 by almost a factor of two, but, in comparison with the previous year, the reduction is insignificant—10 organs of state administration. What are the reasons for this? Why are some organs eliminated and others retained? What is the ideology of the new structure? These are the questions with which our correspondent began the interview with Ye. Arefyev, the first deputy chief of a section of the state commission for economic reform.**

[Arefyev] First of all, it is necessary to note that the new composition of Union organs is calculated for a transitional period. Moreover, it is envisioned that after the signing of the Union treaty, it will be refined appropriately. But regardless of this, work will be conducted on the future elimination of branch state organs as independent economic structures are organized in the form of state corporations, concerns, holdings, economic associations, joint stock associations (societies), and other market structures. In the course of one to two years, the legislators envisage eliminating several more branch ministries, and thereby bring the number of organs of the cabinet to 25-30.

It is absolutely obvious that the new structure of administration of the national economy was formed for the purpose of resolving a dual task: insuring an immediate stabilization of the national economy with a simultaneous and logical establishment of conditions for the transition to a market economy. But in such a situation it is still impossible to count on a real reduction in the number of organs of state administration. After all, an old house is usually not razed when the new one has not been built yet... Moreover, the situation that has evolved in the country (the destruction of economic ties and strikes) has confronted the government with the task of protecting the population and the national economy, and it compelled making a certain "rolling back" from decisive actions already begun for the intensive development of market structures. It must be noted that, in today's situation, it is not a matter of the number of USSR state administrative organs—there can be more or fewer—and it is not a matter of the overall numerical strength of the workers on the staff—there can be more or fewer of them, and this quantity is 10 and more times fewer than in the central organs of foreign countries with developed economies. Today, the deciding factors are the formation of new approaches in the interaction of these organs with enterprises and organizations of all forms of property, effective coordination of the Union organs with corresponding organs of the republic on the basis of demarcation (but not hierarchical) of their functions, and the new concept of the federal state. [Lvov] How will the functions of the ministries and the state committees change? [Arefyev] The existing and the newly organized organs of state administration should revise their functions in a radical way, logically transferring that which is associated with the direct administration of production-economic activity to the level of enterprises and their associations. Managers of corresponding organs of the republics will be brought into the collegiums of the USSR ministries and departments. [Lvov] New organs

have appeared in the cabinet staff. What is the reason for this? [Arefyev] In the administrative scheme adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet, the role of social, ecological, and economic organs and of a new type of market organs of administration has been strengthened.

With a revision of the attitude toward centralized planning, the USSR State Plan has been replaced by the Ministry of Economics and Forecasting, which, as it is proposed, should have priority in comparison with other organs of state administration in all economic questions in the life of the country, including the implementation of price formation policy. At the same time, as previously the function of administering economic reform will be exercised by an independent organ—the State Council for Economic Reform, headed directly by the USSR prime minister. For the purposes of coordinating the actions of the republics in their implementation of economic reorganizations into units that affect the interests of the federation as a whole, it is proposed that the staff of the council be formed from administrators of the republics responsible for the conduct of reforms.

[Lvov] The transition to a market is impossible without the formation of a number of organs of a market type. What is being planned in this direction?

[Arefyev] The progress that has already been made in the implementation of economic reform not only made it possible but also necessary to form fundamentally new organs of state administration. This is, first of all, a state property fund, an antimonopoly committee, a committee to assist small enterprises and entrepreneurship, state inspections (tax, price control, securities), and funds (employment assistance for the population, ecological, and other). It is proposed that for today these organs be organized outside the "boundaries," in other words not be a part of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers.

[Lvov] What kinds of changes will occur in the governmental staff?

[Arefyev] Over the course of several years, state commissions and bureaus for national economic complexes operated as permanent organs of the USSR Council of Ministers. In many cases, the functions of their staff, in fact, came down to being an expert. The concept of "permanent organs" has disappeared in the new structure. The commissions and the bureaus of committees formed on the basis of the commissions are oriented on more topical activity in the resolution of tasks in the development of appropriate national economic complexes.

[Lvov] And the last question. Was it possible to take the path of a quicker and more radical change in the staff of organs of administration?

[Arefyev] Yes, it was possible, and such a variant was studied. In some respects, the legislators were playing it safe. At the same time, it is impossible not to take into account the existing reality in the national economy, the unfinished state of the resolution of questions in the Union treaty, and also the pace of transition to a market economy that is dictated by the situation.

Agriculture

PRAVDA Notes Decline in Food Production

PM1605110391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[Ivan Totskiy report under "Topical Subject" rubric: "It Is Wrong To Expect Someone Else To Bail Us Out"]

[Text] The four short lines in a bold hand took up almost the whole page from an exercise book. "Tell me, for what sins do we suffer such a fate?" G. Stepanov, writing from Kemerovo Oblast, laments. "You look in the food store—the shelves are empty. But we had been hoping... When will it all change for the better?"

How are we to answer G. Stepanov? And not him alone. These alarming questions are to be found in other letters and can be heard in the long lines in which people wait for hours on end.

It is difficult today for the newspaper to hold a conversation with a reader who is tired of the empty food shelves. What he expects, and at times even insistently demands, is this: Give me a straight and honest answer, when will food products appear on these shelves? After all, both those who promised people that the production of agricultural output would stabilize and those who believed these promises cherished the hope that, now that the prices of products have doubled or trebled, the store shelves would not be empty.

Alas, these hopes have proved illusory. And the statistics summing up the first quarter probably seemed puzzling too: The production curve has again slipped downward. By how much? Not so very much, it would seem: only 6 percent. But what is concealed behind this figure? Only the production of bread, bakery goods and pasta, and flour exceeded the level of the first quarter of last year, and all other important types of output showed a decline. For example, 2,556,000 tonnes (86 percent) of meat, 917,000 tonnes (92 percent) of sausage products, and 1,443,000 tonnes (91 percent) of whole milk products were produced. Many readers complain: Have our mineral water springs dried up, given that output of it has fallen by all of 25 percent?

Readers who are already aware of these figures and spotted the trend toward a slide in production are worried: Why has this happened? Why has a fall in the output of basic food products been allowed to occur in all the union republics? Let us name just three of the causes. First, there has been a reduction in the levels of production and purchases of output in kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Second, farms have not fulfilled their contractual obligations with regard to raw material deliveries to processing enterprises. And, third, some output, bypassing the food stores, has been used for barter deals

or was sold at kolkhoz markets, where, owing to its cost, it was beyond the reach of the ordinary customer.

It is no secret that even the USSR Cabinet of Ministers had been hoping that the retail price increases would end panic buying and frighten many customers away from food shelves, on which meat, milk, cheese, salami, and butter would appear. Expensive meat and sausages have indeed appeared, but there are still long waiting lines in the stores for dairy products. Extremely few such products are delivered to the stores, and they are sell out instantly—within two or three hours. The shelves intended for the sale of confectionery, groats, pasta, and vegetable oil are empty.

It is now something of a tradition to reproach neighbors for breaking contracts and refusing to deliver food products to one another. Plenty of these reproaches pour forth, but they are of no benefit to anyone. The disruption of economic ties between regions has only one sad outcome: There is nothing to weigh on the scales in the stores. In the first quarter Muscovites, for example, received 14 percent less meat products than planned, Leningraders 16 percent less, Moscow Oblast 27 percent less, Azerbaijan 17 percent less, Georgia 25 percent less, Turkmenia 36 percent less, Uzbekistan 50 percent less, Tajikistan 61 percent less, and Armenia 73 percent less. There was a marked reduction in deliveries of food products to the all-Union stocks: 49,000 tonnes less meat, 502,000 tonnes less dairy products, and 500 million fewer eggs. Lithuania, the Ukraine, Moldova, and Belorussia are especially guilty of reduced deliveries.

It just goes to show how much declarations and appeals for consensus are worth. While noisy, but empty words are knocking against the a wall of indifference and incomprehension, some republics are surreptitiously putting food sovereignty into practice. And in these circumstances who can say from what sources the granaries of the all-Union stocks are to be filled?

Badly-off people below the poverty line were hoping to live on potatoes and vegetables. Let us recall that the "second bread" grown on collective farmers' personal plots saved villagers and city dwellers in the difficult days of the war. Today even this is in short supply. Vegetable stalls are also often empty. Indeed, how could they be full when, in the first quarter alone, trade enterprises failed to receive 133,000 tonnes of potatoes and 180,000 tonnes of vegetables? And it is probably no accident that N. Zuyev, a resident of Irkutsk, "recommends" in his letter that housewives make soup from...an ax.

The current situation of the food shelves and the scarcity and cost of food are depressing. And what awaits the customer tomorrow? If the peasant is not helped, if he is again left to cope with the fields alone, we will not live to see cheerful prospects. This note of alarm can be heard in the contract agreements for output deliveries in the current year concluded between farms and procurers. Everywhere they are down on last year's volumes. How then can the food shelves be enriched in these conditions if even today they are poor? And in each rayon why not consider in the spring what produce can be grown in additional quantities and laid in in the fall? It is wrong today to expect someone else to bail us out.

Scientific

Cosmos Satellites Launched by Tsiklon Rocket

LD1705110191 Moscow TASS in English 1054 GMT 17 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 17 TASS—The Soviet Union today launched the artificial earth satellites Cosmos-2143, Cosmos-2144, Cosmos- 2145, Cosmos-2146, Cosmos-2147 and Cosmos-2148. All of the six satellites were launched by one Tsiklon rocket booster.

The satellites carry scientific equipment designed to continue space exploration.

The satellites are moving in orbits close to the calculated ones with the following parameters:

—period of revolution - 114.2

—maximum distance from the earth's surface (apogee) - 1,444 kilomtres

—minimum distance from the earth's surface (perigee) - 1,414 kilometres

—orbital inclination - 82.6 degrees.

In addition to scientific equipment, the satellites carry radio systems for the precise measurement of the orbit's elements and radio-telemetry systems to transmit to earth data on the operation of instruments and scientific equipment.

The equipment installed in the satellites is operating normally.

The coordinating and computer centre is processing the incoming information.

Soyuz Launch Announced for 18 May

LD1605222591 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] The booster rocket on the transport spaceship Soyuz that will take a Soviet-British crew to the orbital station Mir has been installed at the Baykonur cosmodrome.

Flight control says the launching of the spaceship is scheduled for 1550 Moscow time [1250 GMT] on Saturday.

It is most likely that the crew, including 27-year-old Helen Sharman from Britain, will fly. The final decision will be made by the state commission on Friday.

Gorbachev Greets Forum of Space Agencies

LD1605125891 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev pledged Soviet readiness to continue taking an active part in international space projects benefiting the entire world community.

He made the statement in a message of greetings to a meeting of space agencies, which opened in Moscow today.

"I am convinced that the future of cosmonautics lies not in star wars but in fruitful work to meet the pressing needs of all nations—big and small, west and east, north and south," the message said.

Gorbachev voiced hope that the meeting, held to discuss preparations for a UN-sponsored international space year, "will help unite a wide circle of specialists and public figures for a comprehensive study of the planet Earth."

"The interaction of many states in exploring terrestrial resources, conducting ecological monitoring from space and using satellite communications for a broad range of humanitarian and technical purposes is a vivid example of how international efforts can be pooled effectively," Gorbachev added.

He wished the Moscow forum success.

Soviet-West European Space Conference Ends

LD1505203391 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT 15 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow May 15 TASS—"The dialogue between Soviet and West European specialists engaged in peace space explorations, was a success," Director-General of the Elektropribor Scientific and Production Amalgamation Yakov Aizenberg told TASS here today.

The three-day conference of the heads of leading Soviet and European aerospace firms ended here today. This is the first meeting of this type.

The choice of the place was not accidental: the Soviet Union is among leading space states having the impressive experience of space exploration, Aizenberg noted. The Soviet space programme is being implemented by top-notch specialists.

The conference was attended by 50 specialists from European countries. The forum's sponsors include the European Space Agency and the Kosmos International Training and Research Centre.

Baltic Republics

Baltic Republics Refuse To Fund Soviet Budget

OW1705115891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 16 May 91

[From "Business Today"]

[Text] Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia do not intend to finance the Soviet budget according to the demands of the Central Government. However, two of the three are ready to transfer money in order to realise separate all-Union budget programs. This was announced during a meeting of the Finance Ministers of the three Baltic Republics at the end of last week in the Lithuanian capital, Vilnius.

According to Elvira Kunevinchiene, the Lithuanian Finance Minister, the republic could be willing to provide joint finance with the Soviet Union for "special, mutually advantageous projects agreed upon by contract". As things stand at the present moment, she said, such projects do not exist.

Latvia and Estonia announced their readiness to pay 340 and 150 million rubles each into the Soviet budget for financing branches of industry, in particular the oil and machine building industries.

Moscow is insisting that the Baltic Republics continue to finance the Soviet budget: The Central Government considers that each republic owes the Union no less than three billion rubles.

Baltic Foreign Ministers View Foreign Policies

PM1605154591 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 3 May 91 p 1

[Foreign Ministry Information and Press Department report: "Conference of Baltic States' Foreign Ministers"]

[Text] Continuing the traditions of the conferences of the Baltic states' foreign ministers and strengthening cooperation and foreign policy coordination, Latvian Republic Foreign Minister Janis Jurkans, Lithuanian Republic Foreign Minister Algirdas Saudargas, and Estonian Republic Foreign Minister Lennart Meri met in Riga 30 April 1991.

An appraisal of the Baltic states' current international position was made during the conference. The basic principles for foreign policy activity of the three foreign ministries were coordinated in connection with the first meeting of CSCE Council of Foreign Ministers and the Baltic states' participation in the Helsinki process. An appeal to the governments of states participating in the CSCE was adopted.

An accord was reached on creating Baltic foreign ministry joint working groups on a number of international political questions.

Issues connected with the Baltic states' relations with the Soviet Union were examined at the meeting.

The conference of the Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian foreign ministers was held in an atmosphere of full mutual understanding. The dates of the next meeting were set.

Latvia Seeks Independence by Year's End

LD1605164791 Moscow All-Union Radio Network in Russian 1500 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] At the end of the year Latvia should restore its status as an independent state. This was stated at a Riga news conference today by Dinevichs, deputy head of the Latvian delegation to the talks with the USSR. The leader of the legislative majority thinks that the meeting scheduled to be held at Jurmala on 23 May is merely a consultation and not serious talks at which a final document could be signed. That is why it is necessary to define the status of the delegations and of the meetings themselves.

Five points of the agenda have been proposed, the first one of which is the draft agreement between Latvia and the USSR. Other issues include the economic relations between the Republic and the Union, financial and credit problems, law enforcement bodies, and the Soviet Army's presence in the territory.

Latvia Discusses Soviet Troop Withdrawal

OW1705044991 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1500 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] The parliament and Government of Latvia have undertaken an obligation to demilitarize the republic and secure Soviet troops pull-out from its territory within a period of two years. These are the cornerstones of the plan drawn up by the Parliamentary Commission for Defense and the Interior to be used at Soviet-Lithuanian inter-governmental consultations.

The commission's head, T. Yudzie told the newspaper "DIENA" these time-limits "are quite realistic, because the USSR has managed to withdraw its troops from Hungary and Czechoslovakia within a year."

Speaking at a session of one of the parliamentary commissions Ilmars Bishers, first deputy premier of Latvia, said negotiations with the Soviet side over troops pull-out are being held at three levels: With the leadership of the Soviet Defense Ministry and Minister Dmitriy Yazov personally, with the top officers of the Baltic Military Region, and at the official consultations between the Soviet and Latvian delegations.

Latvia is primarily interested in defining in the course of these talks the temporary status of the Soviet Armed Forces deployed on the territory of the republic, and secondly, in setting precise time-table for the troop pull-out.

Financial War Between USSR, Latvia Continues

OW1705044691 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1830 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Lativa will not remit money to the budget of the Soviet Union for the carrying out of joint programs. This was the decision taken at a meeting of Latvia's Government on May 15.

The decision was caused by a letter from the Minister of Finance of the USSR Yu. [as received] Orlov to the government of Latvia. The letter said that the decision by the Latvian Government to transfer 350 million rubles to the Union budget did not satisfy the Ministry of finance of the USSR because the sum was infinitesimal. This move by Latvia "could serve as a pre.edent for other republics to scale down their contributions to the state budget", the letter runs.

Mr Ilmars Bishers, deputy prime minister of Latvia, expressed surprise at such an approach of Mr. Orlov to this problem because the sum to be remitted by the republic to the union budget had been fixed during a meeting between the prime ministers of Latvia and the USSR.

Workers Plan 23 May Protest Rally in Riga

OW1705054091 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1830 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] A meeting on Wednesday of the representatives of the staffs of 67 enterprises launched a call to stage a protest rally near the house of Latvia's Council of Ministers in Riga on May 23. On May 4 they had handed over a list of their economic and political demands to Latvia's Supreme Council. The list include the demands to lower prices down to the all-Union average, pass a law on the indexation of incomes, repeal the law on the privatisation of land and housing, sign the Union treaty, etc.

Those taking part in the meeting believe that the rally should be attended by the members of the delegations of the USSR and Latvia at the bilateral talks, the next round of which is scheduled for May 23.

The participants in the meeting did not support the calls for strikes made by some of the speakers. In the view of most of the enterprise representatives, workers are not prepared for such an action at the present time.

The meeting was attended by retired Colonel Igor Lopatin, head of the steering bureau of the internationalist movements of the USSR, and Mr Anatoly Alekseev, leader of Latvia's Interfront movement. Speaking about the rally scheduled for May 23, Mr Alekseev said in particular: "No one is going to hear any pleas for mercy, we must show our strength to the government".

Besides, another rally is to be held at the VEF [expansion unknown] industrial amalgamated firm with the aim of demanding a 300% pay rise, the scrapping of the 5% sales tax on the territory of Latvia, etc.

Precisely this package of demands had been handed over by the VEF's strike committee to Latvia's Supreme Council, the Council of Ministers and the management of the firm.

Mr Sergey Yegoryonok, who represented the VEF's independent trade union, said that the conflict had been brought about by an inequitable sharing of the firm's profits. As much as 60% of VEF's profits goes to the Ministry of Communications of the USSR, and only one fourth of the remaining 40% is earmarked for wages and salaries, he said.

The response to the workers' demands will be given in two months' time since many of them exceed the powers of VEF's management, the firm's executive director Uldys Lautsis said in the DIENA newspaper.

Lithuanian Moderates Seek New Ties With Union

LD1705090291 Moscow TASS in English 0844 GMT 17 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 17 TASS—A group from the Forum of Lithuania's Future published in the TIESA newspaper on Thursday "The Principles Governing Political and Economic Relations Between Lithuania and the USSR". It proposes that the republic join the union as a "special member".

Last month, the Forum of Lithuania's Future united the former Independent Lithuanian Communist Party, Social Democrats, several other political groups and eminent scholars and cultural personalities making up the national elite. The considerable part of the forum's core consists of people, who were among the founders of Sajudis, the ruling national movement.

Former Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene and former leader of the Lithuanian Communist Party Algirdas Brazauskas are among the renown personalities siding with the forum.

The stalemate and tension in relations with Moscow, brought about by Sajudis' course of a decisive break away from the Soviet Union, and increased nationalist tendencies in politics are the reasons why moderate figures working for the state rebirth of Lithuania backed away from Sajudis. The model proposed by them represents a kind of a confederation with the other republics of the present union.

The ten proposed principles include recognising independence as "the primary and indispensable condition for talks between equal states and the signing by them of all other agreements."

The authors of the concept think that market relations and the equality of all forms of ownership can be established in the new union (association). It is the

matter of the residents of the union state only which party or public movement comes to power and by what legal or political means.

The right of the union member-states to "develop foreign economic ties totally independently" envisages, at the same time, streamlining the monetary and fiscal system and the convertibility of the common currency—the rouble.

The state that has a special status in the union, specifically Lithuania, has the right, in the opinion of the forum's members, to gain international recognition, enter the United Nations and create national military structures. Common military spending "should be discussed and endorsed democratically".

Lithuania was not a party to the recent statement by the centre and nine republics that intend to sign the new Union treaty. Republics that do not plan to sign this treaty are thus left outside the single economic space of the new Union.

Lithuania's Butkevicius Warns of Military Action

LD1705071691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 16 May 91

[Excerpt] At today's session of legislature Audrius Butkevicius, general director of the country's Defense Department, delivered a report about the situation in Lithuania. It is causing even greater concern because military provocations have become more frequent recently. Great anxiety is caused by information that the Pskov regiment of an airborne division may be transferred to Lithuania. Very active anti-Lithuanian propaganda is taking place at one of the regiments of the Ryazan airborne division. Use is being made of some possibilities to create national conflicts.

Audrius Butkevicius mentioned the fact that the leaders of the Communist Party in Polish rayons, having met in Moscow with high-ranking officials of the Soviet Union's legislature and government, received instructions on the creation of a eastern Polish republic in the Vilnius area. It was suggested that they adopt such decisions at a congress of the deputies of all levels of the Polish rayons which is to take place on 22 May. [passage omitted]

Lithuania Says Moscow Playing 'Polish Card'

LD1705073591 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 2030 GMT 16 May 91

[Report from the "Parliamentary Studio" by correspondent Lyubov Chernaya]

[Excerpts] The dates of 21, 22, and 23 May provoke suspicion because at that time many events are scheduled to take place. In Minsk a session opens and a strike is planned, on 21 May a conference will take place in Salcininkai rayon, and on 22 May a congress in the Vilnius region is to take place. This causes great anxiety. It is obvious that the Union Government has decided to play the Polish card in relations with the Republic of Lithuania.

Available information concerns, above all, attacks on the customs posts on the Belorussian-Lithuanian border, the use of firearms, the appearance of the military on Lithuania's territory who question local residents where the previous border with Poland was situated. All of this and the attempts by the OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] also to establish where this border was situated and the whipped up comment in the central press about whom the Vilnius region belongs to. All of this increases tension. [passage omitted]

I would like to add that, as far as is known, there are several versions how conflict will start. These versions have been worked out and [passage indistinct]. One of the versions is the preparation to set up a eastern Polish Soviet socialist republic with its center near Naujoji Vilnia. The second version, if the first version is not successful, is to set up a Salcininkai republic with its center in Salcininkai. Any version will be implemented with the help of the OMON and the Soviet Army.

Lithuania-Soviet Army Tensions 'Increasing'

LD1605112991 Hamburg DPA in German 0957 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Vilnius (DPA)—The tensions between the Soviet Army and the Lithuanian national defense forces in Lithuania are apparently increasing. On Thursday the Soviet Army set up checkpoints on the five major roads in Lithuania. There were several armed soldiers and officers in paratroopers' uniforms in tents, next to which were parked military vehicles. Signs in Russian saying "Checkpoint" were put at the roadside.

The chief of the Lithuanian Defense Department, Audrius Butkevicius, told DPA that since last weekend there have been four encroachments by Soviet forces on Lithuanian border and customs posts. Early on Thursday morning the Lithuanian border post near the Belorussian town of Grodno was attacked by about 20 uniformed men armed with machine guns. The attackers bombarded the border post with plastic bullets and signal ammunition for about five minutes. A Lithuanian customs officer was slightly injured.

Lithuanian border and customs posts were erected on the border with the Soviet Union at the end of last year. Border and customs checks are carried out by members of the Lithuanian Defense department, who, however, are not armed. Audrius Butkeviczius described the Soviet Army's most recent action as "an action planned in advance and well coordinated, intended to destabilize the situation in Lithuania still further."

Lithuanian Customs Checkpoint Attacked 15 May

OW1705051591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 0930 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Lithuanian radio has reported quoting the republic's Interior Ministry that last night unidentified persons opened fire from automatic arms at a Lithuanian customs check-point on the border with Byelorussia near Druskininkai.

At 3 a.m. a GAZ-66 car approached the check-point from Belorussia. The persons who came out of it opened fire at the building of the check-point and threw smoke-boxes. The chief of the check-point Modestas Simkonis was hurt in the attack.

It was announced at a briefing at the Lithuanian parliament that similar attacks where made by black berets on May 12-13 on the customs check-point in Salcininkai, also on the Belorussian border.

On Wednesday the Lithuanian Procurator-General Arturas Paulauskas said in Vilnius that every step provided by law should be taken to "cool down" the black berets.

He did not rule out the possibility of "more resolutely repelling armed provocations against citizen and offices of Lithuania". The official explained that Lithuanian laws permit the use of firearms for the protection of government institutions.

Official 'Alarmed' by Attacks

OW1705045891 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1230 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] The head of the department of Home Defense Audrius Butkevicius is alarmed by the recent attacks on the customs check-points on the borders of the republic. He spoke at a briefing in vilnius on Thursday.

Early in the morning on Thursday unidentified persons drove up from Belorussian territory on a truck and opened fire at a Lithuanian customs check-point outside Druskininkai. One person was hurt in the attack.

On May 12 and 13 similar attacks were conducted by Black Berets on a customs check-point in Salcininkai.

Butkevicius described this as a purely Moscow action carried out by the Soviet Armed Forces and Black Berets. He felt that the purpose of the other side is to begin an armed conflict in Lithuania.

Butkevicius said that "on key highways in Lithuania the military have put up five check-points allegedly for checking vehicles." Men in the uniforms of paratroopers are on duty there.

Attacks Continue 16 May

LD1705045891 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Armed provocations against Lithuanian customs posts continue. Last night a customs house on the Lithuanian-Belorussian border near the south Lithuanian town of Druskininkai was attacked and a chief of the customs team, Modestas Simkonis, was lightly injured in the head.

At about 0200 a military truck drove past the customs post and stopped at a distance of some 500 meters. People wearing civilian clothes got out of the car, moved closer, and opened fire with automatic rifles. They also sent signal rockets and hurled smoke grenades and explosives at the trailer in which the customs people and officials of the national defense department were staying. There were over a dozen people in the customs post. The attack lasted up to five minutes, then the assailants boarded their truck and departed.

A wooden bus station caught fire from the shots and explosives, but soon the customs post officials extinguished it. Later, on the site of the assault, officials of the Lithuanian police and of the Procurator's Office found empty cartridges, rubber bullets—which are used by Soviet military—parts of explosives, as well as two charges that failed to detonate.

As was stated today by the director general of the national defense department, Audrius Butkevicius, the attacks on Lithuanian customs posts that began on Sunday [12 May] are part of a prearranged plan with an aim to destabilize the situation in the border zone and to provoke an exchange of gunfire. Following the anti-independence forces might claim that interference by Soviet troops was needed to stamp out unrest and violence in Lithuania.

The chief of the national defense department also informed the newsmen that yesterday the Soviet military set up five posts on the main Lithuanian roads. The posts are well-manned and strongly armed, but their purpose is not yet known.

Lithuania's Brazauskas on Economic Situation

LD1605155091 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 4 May 91 pp 1, 4

[Interview with Algirdas Brazauskas, eminent social and political figure and economist, by A. Gasyunene; place and date not given: "Algirdas Brazauskas: 'People Must Know the True Situation'"; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] We are all alarmed by the state of affairs in the republic economy. Although there is a lack of objective and precise information on the spread and deepening of the crisis, each person can judge according to the family budget where slightly higher revenue resulting from

compensations is offset by repeated increases in expenditure on food and necessities. We asked eminent social and political figure and economist Algirdas Brazauskas for his opinion on the state of affairs in the economy.

[Gasyunene] Having analyzed the republic's economic development in the first quarter, how do you see the situation regarding the production of consumer goods?

[Brazauskas] I think that this is one of the most reliable criteria for judging the real state of affairs in the economy. I have before me the statistics department report, in which there is not a single indicator that would inspire a wave of optimism. Compared with the first quarter last year, there was a fall in production and a decrease in output, in every area. Severe shortages hit ordinary goods that are nevertheless so vital to country life, such as milk cans and buckets, because production levels comprise onlyl one-third of the previous year's levels, with that of polyethylene film at 59 percent, and rubber boots—76 percent. That, I repeat, is the situation in every area. While on the other hand, there was a slump in the production of agricultural products. Never before have we had such a total collapse. Thus, compared with the first quarter of last year, meat production amounted to 73 percent, butter—85 percent, and canned foods—76 percent. The market allocations of vegetable oil barely exceeded one-half of last year's level, and those of fish did not even reach that. As you know, these are basic foodstuffs. I am saying this with one aim in mind: People must know the real state of affairs and realize what difficulties lie ahead for them.

[Gasyunene] You are closely involved in construction. How do things stand in this sector?

[Brazauskas] It is experiencing the same devastating decline: commissioning of major facilities is at approximately half of last year's level. For example, the handover of housing stands at 59 percent, and of kindergartens—33 percent. I think the government must analyze the reasons for this slump thoroughly and find out why sectors, which, until recently, were operating steadily, have come to the brink of an abyss. We will never overcome the crisis without this type of analysis.

[Gasyunene] Now there is a widespread view that, indeed, because of price hikes and the persisting monopolistic trends, the enterprises affairs—in particular regarding profit—are far from all bad....

[Brazauskas] This is an incorrect claim. Even with the price hikes enterprises' profits fell by 60 percent. It follows that contributions to the republic budget dropped too, including contributions for social needs. I am not saying that the government is failing to do such and such or is neglecting this or that. I am merely drawing attention to problems that demand urgent analysis and resolution. One of them in my opinion is in the sphere of production management. The other day, the government adopted a decision on halting the activity of 25 associations and amalgamations. They were originally created in line with the Laws on State Enterprises and registered in the state register. Enterprises have the right to create such noncommercial associations to pool efforts in the field of specialization, production sharing, supplying raw materials, and marketing. This is also why the "Myadis," "Maystas," "Pieno Tsentras," "Gyalzhbetonas" [names as transliterated], and other associations were set up. I cannot understand such gross administrative intervention in the affairs of enterprises and associations. I believe that such cases require legal defense.

[Gasyunene] You head the opposition left-wing faction in the legislature. Of late the opposition has often been accused of unconstructive criticism and viewpoints....

[Brazauskas] I cannot agree with this. On the contrary, we maintain purely constructive viewpoints and reject criticism for its own sake. Here are some examples of the opposition's activity. A draft law on returning property is under discussion—we advocate our own program of action and promote our own tactics, which are well founded. Recently, a draft Constitution of the Lithuanian Republic was submitted to the Supreme Soviet, and this is a major creative work. This is how we treat every major problem—not with a declaration of position, but with a plan of action. In the Supreme Soviet, however, we are the minority, and in a vote the view of the legislative majority prevails.

[Gasyunene] Not long ago in the weekly PRAVITELSTVENNIY VESTNIK there was an interview with USSR Deputy Prime Minister V. Shcherbakov, where he talks about possible economic sanctions against republics not intending to sign the Union treaty. In his words, beginning from the second half of the year, the following measures may be pursued: a switch to world prices in securing raw materials taking due account of the market rate, and later to normal world prices and the unavoidable tariffs, taxes, and duties....

[Brazauskas] It is not the first time such threats have been heard. Ex-prime minister Ryzhkov said the same thing. This is the way the USSR Government treated its partners in what was CEMA. We know how badly this affected the Hungarian, Bulgarian, and CSFR economies. I consider that the legislature and government of today have no more important task than to establish political, economic, and trade links between Lithuania and the USSR, which supplies raw materials, energy sources, and many other things. Here, by normal world prices, the account runs into billions of dollars. Inevitably the question arises: So what can we offer the Kuzbass for its coal, or the Tyumen for its oil, or the Urals for its metal? They need meat, milk, cheese, textiles, furniture, clothing.... These are the very goods of which we are producing fewer and fewer.

I think what is needed today is the utmost concentration of effort, responsibility, and common sense in the name of creating an independent Lithuania.

Lithuanian Recession in Food, Housing Continues

PM1605154191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 May 91 First Edition p 1

[Correspondent Yu. Stroganov report: "Unfinished Buildings, Unfinished Business—Figures Arouse No Joy"]

[Excerpt] Vilnius—In Lithuania over the first quarter, 1,500 fewer apartments were built than in the same period last year. This represents a drop of 44 percent. In the kolkhozes this same indicator fell by 85 percent.

The first-quarter results are no cause for joy in any of the sectors of Lithuania's national economy. Industry reduced its output of produce by a further 3.5 percent. State orders for animal products slumped, especially those for livestock and poultry, which fell by 25 percent. The number of cattle decreased. There was no improvement in the supply of food products to the population. Reserves of most foodstuffs and non-comestible items also diminished. [passage omitted]

Lithuanian Official on Border Incidents

OW1605163291 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1500 GMT 15 May 91

[Text] At a briefing in Lithuanian parliament Wednesday General Prosecutor of Lithuania Arturas Paulauskas said he does not rule out the possibility of a more resolute response to armed provocations against citizens and institutions of Lithuania. He pointed out that the Lithuanian laws allow to use arms for defending state objects.

This statement is caused by the provocations against servicemen of the Lithuanian Home Defense Department and the Lithuanian Customs that took place May 12 and 13 in the Salcininkai region on the border with Belorussia.

It was reported at the briefing that on May 12 servicemen of a Lithuanian frontier post suffered humiliation from unidentified persons who had come in a car. They wore camouflage uniform without identification marks and carried submachine guns.

On May 13 at the Salcininkai autoterminal armed men took several servicemen of the same frontier post out of a bus and again began humiliating them. After that they left in direction to Belorussia in a "Zhiguli" automobile.

Meanwhile, commander of the Vilinius OMON force Boleslav Makutinovich told Lithuanian authorities that OMON "has nothing to do with the incidents". One of the Lithuanian Communist Party Leaders, General Algimantas Naudzhunas also denied involvement.

During the briefing A. Paulauskas reported on the investigation of the January tragic events in Vilnius. He noted that the investigation is hampered by military and communist leaders' unwillingness to give evidence to the Lithuanian Prosecutor's Office and reluctance of the USSR Prosecutor's Office which is also engaged in the investigation to act on equal basis.

According to Paulauskas, the USSR Prosecutor's Office wants to play "the leading role" in the investigation arousing protest of the Lithuanian side. He noted that many witnesses avoid the USSR Prosecutor's Office and answer questions of Lithuanian investigators only.

Landsbergis Bodyguard Allegedly Linked to Death

PM1705085791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 May 91 First Edition p 4

[Unattributed response to reader's letter: "Who Guards V. Landsbergis?"]

[Text] Your newspaper has already reported on the existence of a Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Security Department, but none of V. Landsbergis' bodyguards has as yet been named. Who are these people?

[Signed] Captain N. Musin, Leningrad.

The size of the legislature's Security Department continues to remain a deep secret. One can only form an opinion of the identity of V. Landsbergis' bodyguards from certain information that has percolated to the press. Thus it recently became known that Raimondas Kuzminas is in charge of a guard service subunit.

He was previously chief of Akmyanskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Administration Criminal Investigation Department. He was hired as one of the legislative leader's bodyguards last spring. He has won the confidence of a number of influential members of the republic's Supreme Soviet and government. This is illustrated by the fact, as one Lithuanian newspaper reported, that the order to dismiss Kuzminas from MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] organs was countermanded on Landsbergis' personal instructions. Kuzminas himself is now considered attached to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Presidium while remaining on the active MVD reserve.

The following example illustrates how Kuzminas worked as criminal investigation chief. In May 1988 he and other Akmyanskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Administration personnel arrested citizen N., born 1964, on suspicion of stealing an automobile. He was taken to militia premises and then they began... to beat him up. The "custodians of order" ignored N.'s request not to beat him since he had recently had a stomach operation. It was they who ignored the law. The result was that N. was taken to hospital, where he underwent a further three operations. All the medics' efforts, however, were in vain....

It subsequently emerged that N. had nothing to do with the theft of the vehicle. The father of the deceased made several appeals to law-enforcement bodies regarding his son's beating, but got no intelligible answer. Kuzminas

himself thought it most sensible to "escape" investigation in Landsbergis' bodyguard.

RSFSR

Commentary, Reportage on Yeltsin's CSFR Visit

Visit Seen as 'Breakthrough'

PM1605142391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 May 91 Union Edition p 4

[Correspondent L. Kornilov report: "Visit No Stroll. B.N. Yeltsin Returns From the CSFR Not Empty-Handed"]

[Text] Prague—Great significance is attached here to B.N. Yeltsin's visit to the CSFR [Czech and Slovak Federal Republic], which ended in the Slovak capital Tuesday. All the mass media have provided very prominent coverage of this event.

"We can be satisfied," the newspaper MLADA FRONTA DNES writes. "The popular but problematic figure rated his visit a success. And this is to his credit rather than ours."

The latter reservation means that, in the Czechoslovak journalist's opinion, B.N. Yeltsin overcame quite easily and even elegantly the various doubts and objections which preceded his visit here (like: "Does the head of the Russian legislature have the status to address the Federal Assembly?") and did much to create an amicable and, I would venture to say, mellow atmosphere of communication.

This undoubtedly contributed to the visit's results, including in the sphere of economic ties—ranging from the accord on specific and prompt purchases (on a barter basis) of grain, meat, oil, and goods which Russia needs and which cannot find a market in the CSFR today, to the establishment in the very near future of the "Russian House" joint-stock company in Prague and the Russian-Slovak Bank in Bratislava. Speaking about the aims and results of the visit, B.N. Yeltsin used the word "breakthrough."

Widely cited are the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Chairman's statements that it is inadmissible—as a consequence, as I understood it, of the inaction of political leaders, the stoking of negative public sentiments, and the disruption of former economic ties—to allow a new "iron curtain" to rise up, this time along the borders of neighboring countries which for many years were called "fraternal;" and that the organization of new relations between Czechoslovakia and Russia could, in the long term, serve to build a kind of bridge between Europe and Asia, a vast new economic space. Special emphasis is placed on the claim which B.N. Yeltsin made in the Czechoslovak legislature that Russia's close contacts with Czechoslovakia in no way pose a threat to the USSR's unity and that they do not compete with ties under Union auspices.

Many questions about the internal situation in the RSFSR and the Soviet Union were put to B.N. Yeltsin at a news conference at the airport.

"Russia and, as I have seen for myself, Czechoslovakia," Boris Nikolayevich declared, "have firmly chosen a path from which there is and will be no going back to the past. This path leads from totalitarianism to democracy, and Russia will not deviate from it."

Answering journalists' questions, B.N. Yeltsin deemed it unethical for him to comment, in particular, both on N.I. Ryzhkov's nomination as a candidate for the post of president of Russia and on his own chances in the elections. "After all, I am a superstitious person," he remarked half jokingly, half seriously.

Supreme Soviet Briefed on Trip

LD1605144391 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT 16 May 91

[By TASS legislative correspondents Boris Zverev, Yuriy Kozmin, and Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—Russian leader Boris Yeltsin today described his recent visit to Czechoslovakia as "successful from the standpoint of accords achieved and experience gained."

He made the remarks in a briefing to the republican legislature on the May 13-14 official visit, his first since becoming chairman of the legislature.

While in Czechoslovakia, Yeltsin conferred with President Vaclav Havel, legislature Chairman Alexander Dubcek and leaders of the Czech lands and Slovakia.

Among the signed agreements, Yeltsin singled out the declaration on principles for relations and cooperation between Russia and Czechoslovakia and the bilateral protocol between their foreign ministries.

He said: "We suggested to our partners that they conduct dialogue simultaneously with the central Soviet leadership and individual republics."

"This is not some kind of competition, but a way to enrich relations and deepen contacts," Yeltsin explained. He said his Czechoslovak hosts showed understanding for this view.

Speaking of principles on which relations between Russia and Czechoslovakia could be based, Yeltsin said the two sides "should first of all not be subordinate to any ideological diktat or outrage upon the interests of either individuals or peoples."

He noted the common readiness of Czechoslovakia and Russia to broaden trade "on the basis of direct contacts between enterprises and organisations as well as individual regions."

Yeltsin announced that a Russian working group will leave for Czechoslovakia shortly to discuss major supplies of grain, meat and butter to Russia on the basis of the reached understandings.

Measures To Stabilize Economy Cited

LD1605125491 Moscow TASS in English 1222 GMT 16 May 91

[By TASS legislative correspondents Yuriy Kozmin and Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—The Russian Government's programme for stabilising the economy and embracing free-market principles, approved at the recent session of the republican parliament's presidium, will be published in the press after some additional touches to be made within one week, Boris Yeltsin, president of the Russian parliament, told a plenary session today.

Yeltsin said that he signed an order "On Measures To Stimulate Entrepreneurial Activity in the Russian Federation" with a view to implementing the government programme.

Under his order, construction projects, mothballed or non-operational, will be leased in keeping with the republic's new law on property. The cost of all these projects on Russian territory is estimated at 253 billion rubles.

The republican Council of Ministers was given two weeks to suspend the operation of Union acts that prevent or hinder the implementation of republican legislation on enterprise and entrepreneurial activity in the Russian Federation.

Yeltsin said that temporary regulations on the circulation of securities and the activity of stock markets in the Russian Federation will be approved.

Correspondent Reviews Visit

LD1505090191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0630 GMT 15 May 91

[Text] An official visit by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin to Czechoslovakia is an important political event. Our correspondent in Prague, Vladimir Taranov, reports:

[Begin Taranov recording] The development of bilateral economic and cultural ties was discussed during talks with CSFR President Vaclav Havel; Aleksandr Dubcek, chairman of the Federal Assembly; and other political figures of Czechoslovakia. Boris Yeltsin stressed that it is necessary to analyze and precisely assess the past Soviet-Czechoslovak relations. The main thing is that these relations have a future. The first reaction of Czechoslovak political figures and public representatives to the speech by the chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet in the CSFR legislature was positive. Forthrightness and frankness were noted, as well as a sincere desire by the Russian leadership to build new relations with European states on the principles of goodneighborliness and mutual respect. Czechoslovak journalists drew their attention to the fact that the word friendship is omitted from official documents and speeches. This word was used far too often in the past, and that is why people do not trust it any more. The Czechoslovak and Russian representatives prefer specific actions to words.

Ways of extending economic ties at the republican level were examined during the visit. Czechoslovak enterprises that have been supplying Russia with their goods for a long time are now in a difficult situation because the two countries are carrying out their transactions in freely convertible currency. They have to cut the production of goods that are in great demand in our country, but for which we are unable to pay in world prices.

Boris Yeltsin and members of the Russian delegation expressed interest in the progress of privatization in the CSFR, the process of military conversion, and the way the two republics tackle the issue of cooperation.

A characteristic of this official visit was that the Soviet delegation was warmly received at all levels. If there were certain worries on the eve of the visit, they were dispersed completely during the first meetings between Boris Yeltsin and Czechoslovak representatives. [end recording]

Visit Hailed

OW1605115191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 15 May 91

[Text] Vladimir Lukin, chairman of the committee on international affairs and external economic ties of Russia's parliament, has positively assessed the results of Boris Yeltsin's official visit to Czechoslovakia. Not the least role in making it effective was played by the fact that it had been prepared by experts, he told IF [INTERFAX].

Czechoslovakia was the first foreign country the head of the Russian state paid an official visit to.

Czechoslovakia is known for its surpluses of farm produce. This week, said V.Lukin, a governmental delegation led by Yuriy Skokov, Russia's first deputy prime minister, will go there to conclude barter transactions.

Judging by what Lukin told IF, the chairman of Russia's parliament has alrready received official invitations for visits from several East European countries and from the U.S. Congress.

Visit Termed 'Very Good'

PM1605113991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 May 91 Union Edition p 6

[L. Kornilov report: "Russian legislature Head's Visit to Czechoslovakia: B.N. Yeltsin: Very Good Impression"]

[Text] Prague—In Prague on 13 May the chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet answered the question put by your correspondent on the impression the conversations with CSFR leaders had produced on him in just those terms—that is, very good.

Boris Nikolayevich's visit to Czechoslovakia—his first official visit outside our country as head of the Russian parliament—began that day.

"My trip to Czechoslovakia is not fortuitous," said B.N. Yeltsin. "We wanted to show everyone precisely by the example of Russia and Czechoslovakia how our republics—separate sovereign states belonging to a union and that union itself—can establish cooperation with another country in such a way that they do not fall out with each other. I had a long converastion with Gorbachev literally just before leaving and we came to the united opinion that documents signed by the Soviet Union should be of a strategic and fundamental nature, while regarding specific questions—economics, science, technology, the environment, culture, and so forth—agreement here needs to be reached by us, the republics. This also applies to the CSFR and the Czech and Slovak Republics. It can be said that we are now feeling our way toward the principles governing the new relations between the Union state, consisting in turn of sovereign states, and other countries. The role and share of these 'constituent' states is being defined. That is extremely important.

"My conversations with Vaclav Havel, Alexander Dubcek, and D. Buresova, chairman of the Czech National Council, have shown," the Russian leader went on, "that our positions are similar. Yes, it is impermissible to forget the past, but nor can the future be built on the past. The future should be built on a fundamentally new basis and not on what, through the fault of a totalitarian regime, oppressed us and Czechoslovakia for decades."

At a reception organized by the Soviet Embassy I was next to Alexander Dubcek, chairman of the CSFR Federal Assembly, at whose invitation Yeltsin had come to the country. I asked him whether he agreed with those words.

"Absolutely," the head of the Czechoslovak legislature replied. "A natural process is under way today: the transfer, the delegation of a host of powers downward. It is essential to keep up with this process, and it is very dynamic and therefore not easy to do so. For example, decentralization here in the CSFR is developing apace and life is insistently knocking at the door: ever-increasing autonomy for settlements, cities, and enterprises is needed.

"So, assessing Mr Yeltsin's visit from this standpoint, it can be said that a good start has been made and initiative shown in the right direction. The following opinions are expressed here: B.N. Yeltsin represents 'only' a republic, but he is being received by a federal state. Is this legitimate? I would like to point out to the advocates of such a formalistic approach that Russia is first and foremost a large federation by itself. Second, does this really rule out ties with the Czech and Slovak Republics? On the contrary, in view of the development trends, we must not insist on the letter in such things, but understand the spirit of the times."

"Does it follow logically from this general description," I asked Dubcek, "that Kazakhstan, the Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan, where you spent your childhood, and all Soviet republics will also be welcome in the CSFR as state partners?"

[Dubcek] "Of course, perhaps the talks will take place on a somewhat different level, but that should make no fundamental significance. It is essential to develop such ties in order not to fall behind life—that's clear."

On 13 May B.N. Yeltsin met twice with CSFR President Havel, to whom he conveyed greetings from M.S Gorbachev; held a conversation with Alexander Dubcek; visited the Czech National Council; and chatted with Prague inhabitants on Wenceslas Square. On 14 May he addressed Federal Assembly deputies and in the afternoon flew to Bratislava.

A Declaration on the Principles of Relations and Cooperation between the CSFR and the RSFSR and other documents were signed in Prague.

PRAVDA Discusses Visit

PM1505134791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[Correspondent A. Krushinskiy report: "Not as Simple as All That: Yeltsin's Trip to CSFR"]

[Excerpts] Prague, 14 May—"We must not forget the past but we must not build the future on the basis of the past. The future must be built on the basis of the present, on the basis of our countries' present-day, fundamentally new relations," said B. Yeltsin as quoted in many Czechoslovak newspapers today. [passage omitted]

There was a certain disquiet here in Czechoslovakia prior to B.N. Yeltsin's arrival—would this visit not complicate the already uneasy relations between the USSR and the CSFR. By all accounts these fears were unfounded. On the one hand, M. Zantovsky, the CSFR president's press spokesman, stressed in particular at yesterday's briefing that V. Havel's meetings with Yeltsin "do not signify a recognition of the Russian Republic's independence." On the other hand, Yeltsin points in his statements to the fact that the trip was coordinated with the Union organs. In particular, he conveyed to Havel greetings from M.S. Gorbachev and

informed the Czechoslovak president about the positive changes in relations between the leadership of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and other Union republics and the center.

In Yeltsin's opinion, an agreement of a strategic nature relating to the general principles of cooperation must be concluded at USSR-CSFR level. Whereas giving concrete form to those principles in economic, cultural, and other questions is a function of the Union republics, and the RSFSR is leading the way here. [passage omitted]

Reportage on Supreme Soviet Sessions

Food Sales Tax Abolished

LD1605123291 Moscow TASS in English 1216 GMT 16 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Yuriy Kozmin and Andrey Sulzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—The five percent sales tax introduced by presidential decree last December on most goods has been cancelled on almost all food products throughout the Russian Federation, Boris Yeltsin announced today at a plenary session of the Russian parliament. He told deputies that the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic Ivan Silayev had signed the relevant document yesterday.

The tax remains in force on spirits, tobacco products, coffee and chocolate.

Yeltsin said also that Silayev had signed a resolution "on supplementary measures for the social protection of children and students" which provides compensation to students and trainees for the food price increases. The same document envisages the introduction from July 1 this year of payments to Russian Ministry of Health catering establishments to cover the price increases on certain children's foods.

A number of other republics, mainly in Central Asia, have already rescinded the sales tax on basic food products.

Two Laws Adopted

LD1505124491 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0900 GMT 15 May 91

[Report by legislative correspondent Andrey Nikiforov]

[Excerpt] The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet has adopted two laws. The first is on amendments and additions to the Constitution, the main law of the Russian Federation. The necessity of these amendments and additions was caused by the institution of the post of RSFSR president. It will be published in the press and it is also to be submitted to the Fourth Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, which will take place very soon. The second law that has been adopted is on the procedure for recalling an RSFSR deputy. The decision on this law says that it comes into force from the moment of its publication and that the RSFSR law on the procedure for recalling an RSFSR Supreme Soviet deputy, dated November 1959, is no longer in force. This was a long awaited law both for both voters and deputies. It has been thoroughly elaborated. The fact that not a single deputy in both chambers voted against it testifies to this. Presently the third draft law is being discussed. It is on local self-government in the RSFSR. [passage omitted]

Constitutional Changes Adopted

LD1605174191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1400 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] A Russian Federation law on changes and additions to the Constitution was adopted today at a session of the republican Supreme Soviet. It is connected with the introduction of the post of president of Russia. The new articles set out his remit and define his relationship with the supreme bodies of power. It has been decided to submit the law for approval at the Fourth Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic People's Deputies, which will open in Moscow on 21 May.

Silayev Interviewed

LD1605225291 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2003 GMT 16 May 91

[Report on Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Session on 16 May in Moscow, including interview with Russian Prime Minsiter Ivan Silayev at Supreme Soviet session by correspondent A. Pishchayev; from the "Vesti" newscast—recorded]

[Excerpts] On 18 May, the republican government's program on stabilizing the economy and transferring to market relations will be presented to members of the Russian Supreme Soviet. [passage omitted]

[Pishchayev] There exists a point of view that new measures for stabilizing the economy may in the very near future lead to an improvement in the situation of citizens, and in general really stabilize the economy in our country, including Russia.

[Silayev] I must nevertheless be cautious in what I say. Yesterday, what Shcherbakov said—he was reporting at the cabinet on the joint anti-crisis program, it is called anti-crisis—our program is the stabilization and the transfer to market relations. He made what I consider an over-optimistic statement, to the effect that stabilization will be achieved by the fall, and that next year production levels will be ensured at 1989 levels. These processes are considerably more complicated.

We consider that in 1992 Russians will feel an improvement, and by 1993 or so it will be possible to talk of satisfying the consumer market, and prices will grow not upward but down. This is a preliminary forecast.

Ryzhkov Addresses Lipetsk Workers on Elections

LD1605221191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 16 May 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today in Lipetsk, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov met collectives of enterprises which put him forward as a candidate for the post of president of Russia.

[Correspondent Kraminov] There are just under 500 such collectives. Among them are also the workers of the Lipetsk tractor works, which Ryzhkov visited. Although they nominated the former head of the country's government as candidate for the republic's highest post, the reception given to Nikolay Ivanovich was far from ceremonious. Difficult questions were put to him, sometimes in an extremely irritated tone. Criticism of him was heard—sometimes, in my view, unjust. But the answers to the questions and accusations gave Ryzhkov the opportunity to express his point of view on the broadest range of issues. Thus, Nikolay Ivanovich expressed himself in a sharply negative way regarding the governmental program put forward yesterday, inasmuch as it rejects shock therapy methods, and considers that the basic activity of the present leadership should be the social protection of the broadest strata of the working people, so that 95 percent of the population does not suffer in the course of the reforms being carried out. He supported the idea of considerable price decreases, primarily on children's items.

[Begin recording] [Kraminov] Nikolay Ivanovich, as far as I know, already more than a million signatures have been collected in support of your candidacy. Of course, your support is far from unanimous. What do you think? What part of the population—I mean the social composition and political views—the support of what part of the population can you totally count on?

[Ryzhkov] I am counting on the support of workers, peasants, and intellectuals. I am counting on support of sensible people. I am counting on the support of 95 percent of the people. I am putting forward the renaissance of Russia, but evidently everyone will be putting this forward. The main thing I am putting forward is that we should switch gradually to a market economy, confidently, but in a considered way, so that this does not become a strong social scourge on the population again. [end recording]

TASS Analyzes Support for Russian Candidates

LD1605101191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0935 GMT 15 May 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow, 15 May (TASS)—The campaign for nominating candidates for the first Russian presidential elections in history, due on 12 June, entered a new stage after the candidacy of former head of the Union Government, Nikolay Ryzhkov, was officially supported on Monday by the Russian Communist Party and by the influential "Soyuz" group in the USSR legislature.

The former Union prime minister who had, as observers thought, left the political arena forever, is now gradually gaining a chance to become a real rival to the leader of the Russian legislature, Boris Yeltsin, who until recently had been called the only and indisputable candidate for President of Russia.

At the plenum of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee, support for Ryzhkov's candidacy was practically unanimous. The party leader, Ivan Polozkov, withdrew his candidacy proposed by one of those in attendance. At the plenum there were practically no remarks critical of Nikolay Ryzhkov, even though the government he had headed was, as is well known, the object of the fiercest criticism last year. The adopted resolution notes that he is "well known as a man capable of defending his ideas with principle and uncompromisingly, a supporter of strict order and discipline, and an opponent of taking rash, hasty measures." Viktor Stepanov, member of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] people's deputy, said in an interview with a TASS correspondent: "Responsibility for the state of the country's economy is borne not only by Nikolay Ryzhkov, but also by the Union legislature and the president of the USSR."

The Russian Communists did not conceal that the main aim of nominating Nikolay Ryzhkov was to create real competition for Boris Yeltsin, who relies on the "Democratic Russia" movement.

How likely do those who nominated Nikolay Ryzhkov consider his victory over Boris Yeltsin? Ivan Polozkov said in a conversation with a TASS correspondent that he hoped the former prime minister would win. "Everything will depend on how the party's resources will be brought into play; how its grass-roots levels will function."

Of the candidates nominated to date—and there are already more than 10—the only one who has a real chance of contending with Boris Yeltsin and Nikolay Ryzhkov is Vadim Bakatin, member of the USSR Security Council. He has taken no part in the election campaign yet.

According to the Law "On the Election of the RSFSR President," adopted by the Russian legislature, to elect the president it is sufficient for a candidate to gain a majority of the votes of the electorate taking part in the poll, not a majority of all those eligible, as had been sought by the Russian Communists. In the event of none of the candidates gaining a majority, a second round will be held, at which a simple majority will be sufficient. If some observers think that Nikolay Ryzhkov and the other candidates will be able to gain enough of the votes to prevent Boris Yeltsin from winning in the first round,

few for the moment have any doubt of the Russian leader's victory in the second round.

Funding for Presidential Campaign Detailed

PM1605150991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 May 91 First Edition p 1

[Interview in response to reader's letter with V. Kazakov, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission for the Election of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic President, by unnamed TASS correspondent; first two paragraphs are reader's letter: "Campaign Cost"]

[Text] What will the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] presidential election campaign cost? How will it be financed? Incidentally, who pays for the presidential elections in other countries, in particular the United States?

[Signed] V. Petrovskiy, Nizhniy Novgorod.

Here is what V. Kazakov, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission for the election of the RSFSR president, told a TASS correspondent:

"Some 155 million rubles [R] have been allocated from the RSFSR budget for the campaign to elect the president. Incidentally, that is 42 million more than the cost of the referendum in Russia: The cost of living has risen, not to mention the increased cost of paper, printing, and transport services.

"The main items of expenditure are the operation of 98,000 polling places and the cost of the manufacture and delivery of ballot papers.

Special account No. 701801 has been opened at the RSFSR Central Bank to organize asssistance for the presidential candidates in conducting the election campaign. But it has still to receive funds from various public organizations, enterprises, and citizens. No other forms of finance for the election campaign are envisaged under the Law on the Election of the RSFSR President.

"I went to the United States to observe municipal elections. Typically the state does not bear the cost of election campaigns in the United States: They are paid for by the candidates and the various parties and public organizations that want to support their own candidates. I remember an example where a candidate for the post of county sheriff (chief of police) collected $1 million for his election campaign.

In order to ensure equal conditions for the struggle in the RSFSR, presidential candidates will receive financial support from centralized sources.

RSFSR Presidential Campaign 'Unpredictable'

PM1605150191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 May 91 First Edition p 1

[Report by A. Gamov: "Around 600,000 Signatures in Support"]

[Text] On 14 May V.L. Savakov, leader of the action group conducting N.I. Ryzhkov's election campaign, held a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists.

It was announced that 500 collectives of industrial enterprises, construction sites, kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms], military units, and also a number of public movements have already nominated the popular public figure as candidate for the presidency of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. Around 600,000 voters' signatures have been collected in support of him. In terms of specific regions, for example around 90,000 people supported N.I. Ryzhkov's nomination in Ryazan Oblast, around 80,000 in Belgorod Oblast, more than 70,000 in Lipetsk Oblast, and more than 60,000 in Saratov Oblast. It was noted that the process of nominating a candidate and collecting signatures in his favor are continuing at an increasing tempo.

Journalists were informed that N.I. Ryzhkov, without waiting to be registered as a candidate with the Russian Central Electoral Commission, would go to Lipetsk on 15 May as a USSR people's deputy to meet with workers and specialists of the tractor plant and metallurgical combine and working people in agriculture and other spheres of the economy. During the trip the contender for the presidency intends to acquaint voters with a number of the points in his future election program, which is currently taking shape.

As is known, N.I. Ryzhkov has his own view of the pricing policy being conducted by the current Cabinet of Ministers, and he pays special attention to this in the election program. He therefore intends to consult voters on what should be done—irrespective of whether or not he becomes president—to overcome the exorbitant aspects of the price increase. There are also plans to discuss questions relating to the privatization of housing and the conduct of the agrarian reform.

It was announced that, in the very near future, after registration, N.I. Ryzhkov intends to meet with his agents, of whom there are expected to be 100. As for a proposed candidate for the Russian vice presidency, the contender has not yet made up his mind on that.

There was a discussion of N.I. Ryzhkov's rating on the eve of the election struggle. According to recent research conducted by independent sociological centers, B.N. Yeltsin comes out on top and second place is shared by N.I. Ryzhkov and V.V. Bakatin. However, it was noted that the gap between the three potential presidential contenders is small. There are regions in the republic

where voters support only one of the candidates. Sociological research also shows that there are many waverers among the voters. So the situation is to some extent unpredictable.

The following question was also raised at the briefing: Which of the candidates for the RSFSR presidency will the USSR president vote for at the election, in N.I. Ryzhkov's view? V.L. Savakov said that, in Nikolay Ivanovich's view, the country's president will adopt a neutral stance in relation to all the candidates.

Official Urges Preparations for Privatization

OW1705051991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Mikhail Bocharov, the chairman of the Russian Supreme Economic Council, has declared that the privatization of state property should begin in autumn the earliest. In an interview with IF [INTERFAX] he said that in the next 3-4 months preparatory work should be carried out and several problems resolved.

According to the head of the council which is a consultative body consisting of members of the Russian parliament and economists, the first step is to even out taxes and eliminate benefits enjoyed by a number of industries, companies and public foundations.

The second condition for privatization, Bocharov said, is a fundamental revision of the price system in the country.

He also spoke for the revision of the system of wages which do not exceed 11-12% of the production cost. Bocharov said the figure should be raised to 45-50%. Pensions and other payments to the population should be raised accordingly.

'Democratic Russia' Criticizes Military Action

OW1605115291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 15 May 91

[Text] The coordinating council of the "Democratic Russia" movement has condemned the use of military force against Armenian militia and defenceless civilians and demanded that military actions in connection with the so-called disarmament in Armenia and Azerbaijan be suspended at once.

The coordinating council published a statment describing military actions launched by the Soviet army, interior ministry troops and Azeri special police units as an undeclared war against Armenia which embarked on the path of independence. The statement qualifies raids on the Armenian-populated villages of Getashen and Martunashen located in Azerbaijan as an act of genocide which led to the deportation of their inhabitants. According to the statement, the military launched terror on the pretext of combating Armenian militants who were neutralized as a phenomenon last autumn. "Democratic Russia" said it fears that the slaughter of Armenian policemen in the area of the conflict, particularly the killing of 14 policemen outside the village of Voskepar, will inevitably induce the population to take up arms. This is fraught with turning Armenia into another Afghanistan, provoking an upsurge of anti-Russians in Armenian territory.

The movement's coordinating council demands that military operations aimed at accomplishing disarmament be suspended. It calls for withdrawing 4th army units from the area of the conflict, for replacing them by USSR interior ministry troops, for inviting U.N. military observers, for conducting investigations into all facts of genocide and military terror, and for bringing those responsible for them, up to the Soviet President, to justice.

Explosion at Democratic Russian Headquarters

LD1705100891 Moscow TASS in English 0927 GMT 17 May 01

[Text] Moscow May 17 TASS—A strong explosion occurred at the headquarters of the Democratic Russia movement, one of the country's major political movements, in the centre of the Soviet capital late on Thursday night.

A room where the explosion occurred housed paper sheets with citizens' signatures in support of electing Boris Yeltsin to the presidency of the Russian Federation, in support of electing incumbent chairman of the Moscow City Council Gavriil Popov as the mayor of Moscow and in favour of nationalising the property of the Soviet Communist Party, Yevgeniy Proshechkin, member of the Movement's Coordinating Council, told TASS over the telephone today.

Yeltsin Opponent States Positions

LD1205192991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1130 GMT 12 May 91

[Interview with Vladimir Borisovich Isakov, chairman of Soviet of the Republic of RSFSR Supreme Soviet, by reporter Natalia Chesnokova; place and date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The time that has passed since the Third Extraordinary Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic People's Deputies has somewhat softened the sharpness of the perception of the acts of direct, harsh opposition to Boris Nilolayvich Yeltsin, chairman of Russia's Supreme Soviet. This opposition, which arose simultaneously with the well-known statement by six members of the leadership of Russia's Supreme Soviet, suffered a defeat at the congress, if we bear in mind the objectives it has been setting itself.

Undoubtedly the most brilliant figure among the six is Vladimir Borisovich Isakov. Well, I have said "undoubtedly," but that is my personal opinion. A professor of a law institute from Sverdlovsk, and currently chairman of the Soviet of the Republic at Russia's Supreme Soviet, his views and his actions taken in accordance with these views have evoked an impetuous but mixed reaction. We also have to say that Vladimir Borisovich Isakov's position is also shared by some of Russia's people's deputies, including members of the republic's Supreme Soviet. [passage omitted]

And so, how does Vladimir Borisovich Isakov himself describe his position regarding the work of Russia's Supreme Soviet and regarding various political trends in the deputies' corps? Let me remind you that Isakov himself began his work as a deputy within Democratic Russia.

Reporter Natalia Chesnokova talks to Vladimir Borisovich. The interview began with the following fact from Isakov's biography: Last summer, after the 28th CPSU Congress, he left the party.

[Chesnokova] You left one party and have not joined any other. How would you describe your political orientation? After all, you are a politician, presumably you should be able to join some side.

[Isakov] Well, you see, to my mind, perhaps not just a politician but also, if I may use a lofty word, a statesman, in this instance. From my point of view, a man who holds a state office should work in everyone's interests and should be able to find compromises between views and positions that are at times contradictory. It seems to me that at present it is especially clear than no single group, no single faction or single party has a monopoly on truth.

During the election campaign my sympathies lay with the democrats. I felt that their criticism, with which they entered the elections, contained a lot of truth, a lot of truth. But having come to power, in many ways they began to lose, to my mind, those firm, strong, correct moral positions which they held during the elections. I can see that bit by bit, a little at a time they are moving away from the truth. And so in these conditions I have perforce distanced myself from that group.

[Chesnokova] What are your forecasts for the immediate future in the country and in the republic?

[Isakov] Well, now we have a period of some kind of consolidation in the work of the legislature. In spite of the whole complexity of the third extraordinary congress, the highly emotive clashes took place there, and it is a good thing that they did take place, that they were open, that the positions became clear—now we can work more calmly and more confidently, knowing who is who and what is what. Although I understand that the coming presidential elections are undoubtedly again going to leave a mark of confrontation and bitter struggle on all our work and, of course, will complicate the situation both in the legislature and in the republic. Were it not for this, we could by all means have elections even once a month, people would have fun at these festivities. But regrettably the situation is getting worse and worse. And on top of that it is proposed to pass a law on recalling people's deputies, that means in many constituencies there will be campaigns for recalling deputies. And on top of that it is proposed, if the presidential elections go successfully, to renovate the entire structure of executive power. And I simply fear that the republic will not withstand this kind of tension.

[Chesnokova] Presumably that is why at the congress you voted against including the issue of presidency on the agenda?

[Isakov] That is right. I believe this question has no urgency. That is, it was apparently expressed very clearly in the referendum, no one is denying the significance of the referendum. But from my point of view (?the important thing is) the order in which things are dealt with. We are, right now, a bit like a sinking ship. And to occupy ourselves aboard this ship with elections and re-elections is simply mindless, I think. While stability, to my mind, could fully be achieved within the existing system. [words indistinct]

What does it mean to strengthen executive power? Executive power is not merely the presidential level. In our country executive power starts with the village or settlement soviet. In order to strengthen that power it should be strengthened not just at one level but at every level.

[Chesnokova] But this is envisaged.

[Isakov] You see, now that we have taken this step, strengthened merely the presidential level, what is the response? Well, Tatariya has already announced the election of its own president. The question is, have we thus strengthened the system of executive power or have we weakened it? What will the rights of the republics be in this new system? This will be determined equally by the federal treaty and appropriate amendments to the Constitution, so that powers have on the one hand a clear legal basis and on the other certain limits.

[Chesnokova] In the mass media, in particular in the press, you often repeat the argument that we are going toward, or have even already reached, a new dictatorship. What did you have in mind?

[Isakov] In fact the political system which we had, although it was called a socialist and democratic society, was in many ways a one-party dictatorship. Well, it would appear that the new stage in our political life, the elections, brought about a certain pluralism. New forces came here, to the legislature, into these walls. I see in many cases that these forces use the same methods which the previous political forces used, that is, they put their supporters everywhere, they violate the law in exactly the same way or at times even more so; at times there is even more, rather than less, incompetence and superficiality

in the solution of very serious issues. The most dangerous thing, to my mind, was manifested during the congress. These new forces, which call themselves democratic, using the difficulties in the economic situation, are in effect threatening even the constitutional bodies of power, inciting the people.

[Chesnokova] Well, today it is perfectly clear that it is not the democrats who have the power, it is the other side. What kind of dictatorship can you have without any attributes of force?

[Isakov] You know, to my mind, we are watching a kind of game. If we speak about power as a whole, indeed, the democrats do not have it. But neither does the party, because, let us say, in the Russian legislature it is clear that the communist party has no significant influence of any kind.

Let us look again at foreign practice. There the authorities alternate, for instance, social democratic parties, for instance, conservative parties. Nevertheless, all this notwithstanding, they pursue some sort of, well, balanced policies, that is, they do not go for extremes. In this situation, when, let us say, the islands of their power are so far not all that great, have the new democratic forces built a correct line, having come to power? You cannot all at once turn the massive and heavy ship of the state through 90 degrees. It could capsize completely in such a case, when one tries it like that. That is, we have shattered the social system and weakened authority. People say there is no authority at all in the country. What is this a result of? In my view it is a result of unwise, ill-considered policies, including also by the democrats. Issues such as privatisation, issues such as land, land ownership, let us say, should be adopted in conditions of public consensus. As soon as we move away from this, as soon as we adopt these decisions through some tricks, whom do we deceive? We deceive the deputies of the Supreme Soviet. But our power goes no further. If society within itself is not yet ready for these solutions, it is not going to accept them. This, to my mind, is one of the main causes why our Russian laws are not working. Market relations, market mentality, market thinking cannot be created through administrative methods.

[Chesnokova] Just now in one of your statements you (?touched on) the law on referendums. When you spoke at the congress you proposed that it be suspended. Is that really necessary?

[Isakov] Indeed. I believe it is totally necessary to suspend this law. The point is that any process should have an accelerator pedal but it should also have a brake, while we have created this law without brakes. That is, any 350 (?major) deputies, by making the appropriate submission, can, acording to this law, launch processes of a referendum which no one has the power or the right to stop. This has already happened once with the Russian referendum, and it included major violations of the law itself. Before the presidium now there are referendum applications on 10 other issues. Consequently I believe that the law on referendums, in our real conditions, in our real political life, has simply become an object of political games.

[Chesnokova] Could you tell us, please, since this concerns you directly, about the law on recalling. You have just said that we do not need it very much at this time either.

[Isakov] I should say right away that this is not a question of my interests or, say, personal apprehensions. I simply believe that in the present conditions a campaign for recalling deputies is simply going to contribute an additional factor for destabilizing the situation. Obviously, right now there is no deputy who would satisfy everyone. That kind of deputy stays quiet and does nothing. But as soon as a deputy speaks on an important political issue, he immediately finds himself under fire from some portion of his voters who hold different views.

[Chesnokova] But a deputy is meant to reflect the will of his voters.

[Isakov] That is correct. But first, the voters' will itself is very heterogenous right now. That is why perforce the deputy has to be quided by common sense, a sensible approach, his own sense of responsibility in these instances. But because of this, it is not absolutely necessary, first of all, to keep, let us say, and axe over his head at all times. After all, when electing the deputy you should have looked and seen whom you were voting for. And secondly, I believe that right now the prevailing political situation itself is simply red hot to the limit, while the law on recalling will add a few more logs to this stove that is already red hot. Even judging from the responses that come in, my position is now accepted by signficantly more people. But even at the time, the proposal to recall me did not get more than 50 percent support.

[Chesnokova] It got 49.

[Isakov] Forty-nine. And that is a lot, of course that is a lot. But I do not think that this figure has since increased.

[Chesnokova] Could you tell us, after the third congress did you go back home?

[Isakov] Unfortunately I could not get back there, to my own constituency to meet the voters, but I have been meeting voters here, in Moscow, I have been going around the factories. People ask a great number of questions. And of course people would like to know some of the personal motives of this statement and the supplementary report which I presented.

[Chesnokova] Now a question which interests many people. Could you tell us why the statement by the six—that is the name under which it is now going to enter history—was delivered by Svetlana Petrovna? Because judging from everything, judging from the fact

that the alternative supplementary report at the congress was delivered by you, you are the (?common) ideologist of the, well, opposition, although I do not know how you are going to like this word. Why was it Svetlana Petrovna?

[Isakov] Well, first, I would not agree that I am some sort of ideologist, because all the six leaders of the Supreme Soviet who signed the statement are sufficiently independent people, with their own views and their own positions. Svetlana Petrovna's speech was completely and absolutely her own initiative. Also, by virtue of her office, because she and Boris Mikhaylovich are deputy chairmen of the Supreme Soviet. She also thought that a speech by a woman in the circumstances might be better received, might create a less aggressive impression. That is why she insisted that she should deliver the statement. Quite bravely, I believe.

[Chesnokova] And another question. I looked at the voting records—you had roll-call votes on all issues—and you very often abstain. Could you tell us, is that your position, or otherwise, so to speak?

[Isakov] No, that is not the point. The point is that ideally, I believe, two positions are sufficient in a vote—for and against—because if you have not voted "for," it means you do not support the idea. But the existence of the "abstain" position makes it possible to grade, in a sense, to what extent you do not support it; do you merely not support it, or do you not support it with indignation? My position sometimes is that I do not abstain because I am resolutely against a certain idea but because I believe it was badly prepared. But you do not always get the opportunity to explain this, as I have with you now.

Western Republics

Moldova People's Front Independence Plan Fails

LD1405145191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1350 GMT 14 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Demidetskiy]

[Text] Kishinev, 14 May (TASS)—The proposal that the Republic of Moldova should withdraw from the Soviet Union and proclaim a declaration of independence did not gain the support of a majority of deputies in Moldova's Parliament. The proposal was put on the agenda of the Supreme Soviet of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] which opened today by deputies of the republic's People's Front.

Aleksandr Moshanu, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Moldova SSR, who spoke on this issue on the eve of the vote stressed that "discussion of this problem is premature." It will become possible after a republic-wide referendum is held on the issue. An attempt to put the nationalization of property belonging to the Communist Party of Moldova on the agenda also failed.

Moldovan Prime Minister Said Asked To Resign

OW1705051691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] According to the newspaper of the Moldavian [Moldovan] Parliament SFATUL CEDRI, the Prime-Minister of the republic Mircea Druk was asked to resign on Wednesday. No details are reported, still the paper says that police reinforcements have been sent to the approaches of the parliament building to confront the supporters of the Prime-Minister who might come to protest.

Moldovan President Announces Anti-Crisis Program

OW1705100891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 16 May 91

[From "Business Today"]

[Text] The Moldavian [Moldovan] President, Mr. Mircha Snegur, at a session of the republican Parliament announced the Government's anticrisis program which contains a package of extraordinary measures for stabilishing the economy and the financial situation in the republic. Mr. Snegur emphasised that "the privatisation of the manufacturing potential of the republic" was a vital factor.

The president said that to successfully carry out privatisation, to establish market structures, and to limit inflation it was necessary to increase the role of the government.

As far as the introduction of a national currency is concerned, Mr. Snegur remarked that this was the "most effective means of defending the consumer market of the republic and its finances." However before taking such a step "the political and economic results" would have to be carefully considered.

The government program put forward suggests keeping state contracts for enterprises at a level of between 70% and 80%, introducing higher taxes for investment projects of more than two years duration, allowing the sale of materials produced above the amount envisaged in the plan, the total value of which Moldavia estimates at 4.5 billion rubles.

The republican government is ready to work out a special program to attract foreign investment and to encourage the creation both of joint ventures and of companies with 100% foreign ownership. Mr. Snegur remarked that firms intending to work in agriclture, construction, or tourism will be given concessions.

In order to carry out the anticrisis program, said the President, the Parliament will have to adopt laws on privitisation, on the banking and financial sectors, on tax inspection, and on foreign trade and customs.

Mr. Snegur described the economic situation in the republic as "near to chaos". The volume of industrial

production dropped in Moldavia in the first quarter of 1991 by 5% in comparison with the same period last year, while the national income fell by 9.3%. The fall in production in the agricultural sector for the first three months of this year amounted to 23%.

The republican budget deficit, according to Mr. Snegur, may be as high as 2.5 billion rubles, a fact which puts the financing of social, ecological, and production projects under threat. The income of the Moldavian budget as adopted by the republic's parliament in January of this year amounts of 4.9 billion rubles.

'Fiery' Disruption of Khmara's Trial Reported

PM1605121791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 May 91 Second Edition p 6

[Report by correspondents M. Odinets and I. Tikhomirov: "Trial Has Begun, But...."]

[Text] Kiev, 15 May—Recently people with an interest in doing so have been using all kinds of manipulations over the Khmara case in an attempt to aggravate the already troubled situation in Kiev.

Yesterday the case's examination began at a court session. Now everything should seemingly go according to the procedure stipulated by the law. Alas, before taking his place next to his codefendants in the dock, People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, released from custody only the day before for health reasons by a decision of the Supreme Court, read out a speech far removed from the confession of a suspect. He repeated his selection of curses and accusations against the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet and its chairman, L.M. Kravchuk. The audience gathered at the entrance to the oblast court building, and they were mainly "brought in" from Lvov oblast and other oblasts of the republic, welcomed with delight their idol, who has been proclaimed "the hero of the Ukraine." Placards reading "Communist fascists" and "Do not touch Khmara and there will be no thunder!" rose above the crowd.

In the auditorium itself there was a new surprise: hysterical crises from one of the defendants, coarse swearing, threats, and "fiery" speeches by some people's deputies who are Khmara's fellow fighters in the legislature. The trial had to be adjourned until the following day.

This morning it all started again. Again the defendant caused a scandal, shouting out insults and obscenities. Individual Ukrainian people's deputies, instead of discussing the concept of the new constitution in the legislature's auditorium, demanded that the number of defense representatives be increased, although there are already 15 of them, and that more suitable premises be provided....

After a two-hour explanation of procedural questions, which took place in an abnormal atmosphere, the chairman was obliged to adjourn the session until tomorrow.

Our newspaper has already reported the incident played out 7 November in the underpass on October Revolution Square when with the participation of Stepan Khmara and under his leadership a cynical attack was made on Militia Officer N. Grigoryev. His personal weapon, official identification, and portable radio were taken from him. Colonel Grigoryev was hospitalized as a result of the beating. During the investigation, S. Khmara and his accomplices, four of whom had previous convictions, did everything they could to shift the incident to a political plane. They were given the most active assistance in this by the so-called independent democratic press. In their pages the newspapers vied with one another in dignifying S. Khmara with the title of knight, hero, and son of the nation and promised him a firm place as a legendary fighter in the annals of history....

So far he is charged with exceeding his official powers together with violence and robbery by a group of people with a view to taking state property and the theft of personal documents.

All this does not combine well with attempts to create the image of a hero. It is even worse that the court has been obliged to work under conditions of intolerable pressure created by the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka and the republican party of which S. Khmara is deputy chairman.

Ukraine Legislature Debates Draft Constitution

OW1505180891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2102 GMT 14 May 91

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine began debating the draft of the republic's new constitution on May 14. The parliament's morning session, however, was on the verge of being disrupted following the refusal of some of the communist deputies to consider only one draft of constitution, the one submitted by the parliament's constitutional commission. They insisted on a simultaneous discussion of an alternative draft drawn up by the Ukraine's Communist Party Central Committee, which envisages, among other things, the inclusion in the constitution of the clause "the socialist choice made by the people".

The draft of the constitution drawn up by the constitution commission was introduced by Mr. Leonid Kravchuk, Chairman of the Supreme Soviet, who also addressed the session.

According to the draft, if the new constituion is to be adopted, the republic's official name will be THE REPUBLIC OF UKRAINE. (The alternative draft suggested a number of other names for the republic—The Ukrainian Democratic Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, the Soviet Socialist Republic of Ukraine, etc.)

The form of government is a republic. The constitutional order is presidential republic.

The draft provides for a division of authority into the legislative, executive and judicial branches.

The president will be elected by a universal, direct and equal vote by secret ballot.

The Supreme Soviet is to consist of two chambers—the People's Chamber elected for a term of three to four years and the Chamber of Representatives (Senate) elected for a term of 6 years.

The draft of the new Constitution of the Ukraine provides for a multi-party system in the republic and contains safeguards against the fusion of party and state authorities.

During the discussion of the draft of the new constitution, a proposal was put forward not to include in it the provision of the Ukraine belonging to the Soviet Union.

Belorussian Legislature May Face Strikes

OW1705092491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1830 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Leonid Sviridov, of the press service of the strike committee of Minsk, has told if [INTERFAX] that industrial workers and strike committee representatives from all over Belorussia will come to the city's central square on May 21, the opening day of the requiar session of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet, to await the session's decision with regard to the agenda. Unless parliament accepts the agenda suggested by the strike committees, the republic will be paralysed by a general strike on May 22.

The strike committee's demands were published by the republican newspaper ZNAMYA YUNOSTI on Wednesday. The Belorussian parliament is urged to pass a new election law guaranteeing all Belorussian citizens equal voting rights; immediately cancel the 5-percent sales tax; order a rise in wages, student grants and pensions; bring the compensation to the population in line with the rises in state retail prices; remove party cells from all government agencies; nationalize the Belorussian Communist Party's propertyand use the released funds in fnancing the re-settlement of Chernobyl victims to safer places, as well as the development of education and health care; deprive the party and government apparatchiks of all privileges; cancel the Communist Party's control over republican television, radio and printshops; give all political groups in the republic equal opportunities for using the media; and replace Alexander Stolyarov from his post of head of Belorussia's TV and Radio Broadcasting Committee, for his "witch-hunting policy" of barring journalists from work for ideological reasons.

Three Economic Roads for Belorussia Suggested

OW1505212691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1805 GMT 14 May 91

[From the "Business Today"]

[Text] Belorussian experts have published the three most likely possible scenarios for the economic situation in the republic in 1991.

The first scenario is based on the premise that the recession in the main branches of industry will continue. In this case the supply to Belorussia of vital forms of raw materials and ready made parts will fall by 25%. In such a case the economy could see several negative changes which will take years to correct.

The Belorussian national income will fall in 1991 by an estimated 20%, all social programs will come under threat, and the personal income of the population will fall by 15-20%. In such a situation the next twelve months will not prove sufficient to stabilise the situation in the economy. The reasons for this lie in the situation in industry, unemployment and the rise in the budget deficit.

The second scenario envisages a rapid transfer to market relations. This will trigger the harshest drop in production—up to 30%or more. The number of unemployed could amount to one fifth of the total working population. The main part of the population will find itself under the poverty line and the social and political situation will reach an extreme crisis which will lead to social tension and conflicts.

The third scenario for the future of the economic situation in Belorussia envisages that the volume of supply of material products to the republic will remain at the last year's level, established economic ties will be maintained, production and labor discipline will be strictly observed and agreement signed between republics will be fulfilled. Belorussian economists consider that in such a case destructive changes in the Belorussian economy could be avoided.

Caucasus

Georgian Candidate's Headquarters Seized

PM1705091591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 May 91 p 1

[Correspondent N. Mikeladze report: "Tbilisi: Presidential Candidate Goes on Hunger Strike"]

[Text] The militia has seized the headquarters of Professor Valerian Advadze, one of the candidates for Georgian president. This happened at 0200 hours 12 May. Writer Chabua Amiredzhibi, movie director Revaz Chkhaidze, literary magazine editor Roman Miminoshvili, and writer Tamaz Kvachantiradze were present in the Planning and Management Institute, of which V.

Advadze is the director.... This is pretty understandable: There are less than two weeks to go until the presidential elections, and almost all these representatives of the Georgian intelligentsia are in V. Advadze's support group. (T. Kvachantiradze, admittedly, is a candidate, too).

But the militia was not drawn by the abundance of important names known to every Georgian resident. They were interested in four imposing young people.

They subsequently described themselves as officers from the Moscow Criminal Investigation Department working for the "Zayavka" Private Security Cooperative. They said that they had concluded a month-long contract with Advadze to the tune of 12,000 rubles.

This all came to light later. On Sunday night the militia met with resistance. And, as is clear from the statements made by militia representatives, the intelligentsia prevented the bodyguards from being seized. As a result, Professor Guram Koranashvili suffered a broken hand and Chabua Amiredzhibi took a severe beating.

In subsequent television broadcasts, the militiamen showed four of their injured men, too. One of their faces did indeed bear the marks of a professional fight. In the course of television debates, V. Advadze expressed distrust in the militia and the Prosecutor's Office, which had failed to find the people who shot at his apartment last fall before the parliamentary elections. The militia, he said, now serves just one candidate—Zviad Gamsakhurdia.

Law enforcement representatives suggested in response that the four young bodyguards were most probably working for the KGB rather than the Moscow Criminal Investigation Department, and that their documents were obvious forgeries.

And yet the question seemed to remain: Just what kind of candidate would recruit such assistants? But one way or another they have been released.

It has become known that USSR People's Deputy Professor Valerian Advadze has gone on a hunger strike. He explains this extreme form of protest by citing the continuing provocations against him and his supporters.

Georgian People's Front Protest to RSFSR

AU1605113391 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 23 Apr 91 p 3

[Open letter to the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies from the Georgian People's Front and its chairman Nodar Natadze, 15 April 1991]

[Text] Gentlemen,

In connection with your resolution regarding the events in the town of Tskhinvali and its region in which you are still taking the liberty of referring to the excesses in Shida Kartli as "events in South Ossetia," the Georgian People's Front considers it its right and duty to bring to your notice the following.

In connection with Paragraph 2:

A) Your appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia to "raise the blockade" is based on an incorrect and, which is even more important, incomplete information, because neither the Georgian authorities nor any other public forces are blockading the supply of any particular type of foodstuffs, energy, or other materials to Tskhinvali or to its region. The access to the region from the north is not under Georgian control (the [Soviet] troops alone are controlling it). The Georgian militia controlling the access from the south is not limiting the importation of any of commodities, except for weapons. Anyone, including you, esteemed deputies, has the right to organize the supply to Tskhinvali, along Georgian roads, of anything (with the exception of weapons and munitions), and you will only have the right to talk of a "blockade" if you meet with any obstruction organized by the Georgians.

It is the Georgian villages situated in the zone directly north of Tskhinvali that are being subjected to a real blockade. These villages include [name of village indistinct], Achabeti, Kurta, Kekhvi, Kemerti, Sveri, Dzartsemi, Kheiti which, for more than two months, have been made inaccessible on all sides by the armed Ossetian gangs and the [Soviet] troops. The troops do not allow the militia to clear the road and do not allow our helicopters to make flights to these villages. As a result, it is impossible to deliver foodstuffs or bring a doctor to these villages, or evacuate a sick person or a woman in labor from them;

B) Speaking of "refugees," you, esteemed deputies, apparently have in mind citizens of Ossetian nationality who moved from the dangerous locations in Georgia to their homeland, which is presently called "North Ossetia." You should have known that it is not the fear of Georgians that is driving these people away. They do not and never had any reason to be afraid of the Georgians. They are driven by the fear of the incessant shooting in the region—shooting not by Georgians but by the Ossetian gangs that were armed by detachments of the Soviet Armed Forces. Incidentally, one-half of these gangs are people of Ossetian nationality who are not local residents. You should have also known that, for very many persons in this category, the motive for the departure from Georgia was the striving to take out of Georgia, as soon as possible and under the escort of armed personnel carriers of the USSR troops, the property stolen from the Georgian homes in Tskhinvali left by their owners. We hope that the Georgian Government will not organize their return to Georgia because it did not organize their departure.

In connection with Paragraph 1:

A) It is to be hoped, esteemed deputies, that the Georgian Supreme Soviet will not comply with your request,

because the existence in Georgia of Ossetian autonomy in the form of the "South Ossetian Autonomous Region" created in 1922 was **an illegal and unjust act** that limited the sovereignty of the Georgian state on a part of its territory and the right of the Georgian people to their own land. You may know that the bulk of the present Ossetian population settled in Georgia in the 19th century as landless ancillary workers to help families of local Georgian farmers. Moreover, according to official materials dating back to the end of the last century, at that time, not a single Osset owned land in Georgia. (Footnote 1) (See, for example, "The Collection of Statistical Data on the Population of the Transcaucasian Region Based Upon Family Lists of 1886," published by order of the Chief of the Transcaucasian Statistical Committee Responsible for Civil Affairs in the Caucasus, Tiflis [Tbilisi], 1893) Taking advantage of the striving of landless peasants to own land, the Bolsheviks in the south of Russia organized in 1918 armed Ossetian actions against the government of the then independent Georgia. These actions looked like political ones on the surface of it (they proceeded under the slogan of establishing the Soviet power) or like national (anti-Georgian), but, in fact, they were purely agrarian. These actions were characterized by extreme cruelty. They were suppressed by the Georgian National Guards in 1919-20. (It is precisely this episode that, for the last 70 years, has been presented to the Ossetian population as "genocide against the Ossetian nation perpetrated by the Georgians, in spite of the fact that there is no mention of Georgian cruelties or mass repressions in the history of those years). After they conquered Georgia in 1921 and established Soviet power in it, the Bolsheviks continued to arm Ossetian gangs and to set them against the Georgian population, that is to say to exercise genocide against the Georgians. In that way, the populations of several Georgian villages were massacred, and masses of Georgians had to flee the region. Then, a part of Georgian land that was absolutely arbitrarily delineated and that never constituted a separate geographical, political, or economic entity was renamed "Ossetia" and granted national autonomy, in other words, Ossetians received a preferential right to rule over this land in pursuing their own national interests. In order to understand the logic of this bandit-act perpetrated by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and by the USSR against Georgia, it would suffice to imagine the following situation: Somewhere in Germany, where there are many Turks, a "Western Turkish Autonomous Land" is organized or, in the area of Marseilles, where there are many Algerians, a "North Algerian Autonomous Region" is established; they would subsequently demand that western Turkey be united with eastern Turkey and northern Algeria with southern Algeria.

You, esteemed deputies, being politicians, ought to realize that the principle for resolving territorial issues that you are proposing cannot be adhered to by mankind: If the rights of a given nation on a given territory are subordinate to the demographic dynamics on the given territory, this will inevitably cause one nation fear the demographic prosperity of another nation, that is to say, it will create objective conditions for national hatred of the worst kind and even for genocide.

As politicians, you must also realize that the right to territorial inviolability is an inalienable right of any nation. Otherwise, your country would not have had the right to wage the bloody war against Hitler thereby subjecting the people to sufferings that were worse than those of the refugees of both Georgian or Ossetian nationalities. Your ancestors and compatriots decided not to put down weapons as long as at least one armed enemy remained on Soviet soil. What right then do you have to condemn our determination to continue the lawful actions of the militia, which is disarming the bandits for as long as there remains at least one armed claimant upon our land (in practice as long as there remains at least one armed bandit trying to exterminate or expel the indigenous Georgian population from the region)?

You, esteemed chairman and esteemed deputies of Russian nationality, must also remember the essential difference that exists between the national-territorial autonomies in the RSFSR and the former Ossetian autonomy in Georgia: The peoples whose names the RSFSR autonomies bear are, in most cases, indigenous on the given territories. They do not have any other homeland outside the given territory, and the Russians there are a new element in the population of the given territory and they have their own territory outside the boundaries of the autonomies. As pointed out above, the Georgian population on the territory of the former Ossetian autonomy in Georgia is indigenous, whereas the Ossetian population is new; it is not the Georgians who came to the country of the Ossetians but, on the contrary, Ossetians who came to the country of the Georgians. (Or, maybe you, esteemed deputies, speaking of the pragmatic character of contemporary world politics with regard to certain regions, are going to altogether deny the historical right of the nation to a territory?).

In connection with Paragraph 3.

You, esteemed deputies, are apparently aware of the fact that pardoning a criminal is an infringement upon the rights of his victims. We hope that the Supreme Soviet of Georgia will reject your proposal, which, mildly speaking, is tactless, since the persons mentioned by you were detained on suspicion of organizing assassinations, arson, and other crimes against the individual and property.

In connection with Paragraph 4.

The USSR president's interference into the internal affairs of Georgia is an aggression and, therefore, the call for this interference is a call for aggression against Georgia. The only organization that has a moral right to oversee the policy of the Georgian Government, as well as of the government of any other country, with regard to its citizens, including ethnic groups, is an authorized UN commission whose formation would be most desirable.

Advocating Soviet aggression against sovereign Georgia, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is thereby adopting the position of the most bare-faced Soviet imperialism, and this is regrettable.

[signed] The board of the People's Front of Georgia; Nodar Natadze, chairman of the People's Front of Georgia, 15 April 1991

Resolution on Georgian Presidential Elections

AU1705101591 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 25 Apr 91 p 1

["Resolution of the Central Electoral Commission on the Republic of Georgia Presidential Elections in Connection With the Holding of Presidential Elections in the Republic of Georgia," issued 22 April 1991]

[Text] The Central Electoral Commission for the Republic of Georgia Presidential Elections resolves as follows:

1. In accordance with the Law of the Republic of Georgia "On the Republic of Georgia Presidential Elections," to entrust the conduct of the elections to the territorial electoral commissions of the assemblies of the Republic of Georgia; to the Batumi, Gori, Zugdidi, Rustavi, Poti, and Kutaisi City Electoral Commissions; to the local electoral commissions of Tbilisi; to the Sukhumi No. 102, Tkvarcheli No. 103, Pitsunda No. 105, Gudauta No. 106, Sukhumi No. 107, Gulripshi No. 108, Ochamchir No. 109, and Gali No. 110 Electoral District Commissions; and the polling station electoral commissions which conducted the Republic of Georgia referendum on 31 March 1991.

2. To permit the above-listed territorial, local, and district electoral commissions, if necessary, to change the composition of the polling station electoral commissions or to form new polling station electoral commissions. The formation of new electoral districts and polling station commissions is to be completed by 11 May 1991.

3. To permit [parties] participating in the elections for the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet and groups of electors submitting presidential candidates each to appoint one member to the territorial, local, district, and polling station electoral commissions, if the commission in question does not contain such a member. For this purpose, the parties and groups of electors must present applications to the relevant territorial, local, and district electoral commissions.

4. To instruct the newspapers of state organs of the Republic of Georgia, Georgian radio, and Georgian television to publish statements of parties, election blocs, and groups of electors that have presented presidential candidates, only if they are submitted by the Press Center of the Central Electoral Commission (or, in the case of regional and town newspapers, by the press center of the relevant electoral commission).

5. To instruct the state organs of the Republic of Georgia, Georgian radio, and Georgian television to allocate equal space and time to the presidential candidates and those who nominated them for the publication of election campaign materials.

[Signed] V. Khmaladze, deputy chairman of the Central Electoral Commission.
22 April 1991.

Georgia Protests Restoration of South Ossetia

AU1705095891 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 9 May 91 p 1

[Letter to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of Nationalities, from the Presidium of the Georgian Supreme Soviet and from Zviad Gamsakhurdia, president of the Republic of Georgia, 7 May 1991]

[Text] It has become known to us that on 6 May 1991, in the town of Tskhinvali, at the illegally convened session of the oblast soviet of people's deputies of the former South Ossetian Autonomous Region, the decision was adopted to abolish the so-called "South Ossetian Soviet Republic" and restore the autonomous region, which, while being a part of the Republic of Georgia, will, at the same time, be under the "administrative" jurisdiction of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. All of this is happening at a time when, based on the constructive agreement reached on 24 April 1991 and in accordance with the resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of Nationalities, a commission is being created that will be composed of deputies of supreme soviets of the USSR, RSFSR, and the Republic of Georgia with the participation of a representative of the Ossetian population residing in Shida Kartli [area of Georgia into which South Ossetia has been incorporated by the Georgian Government].

The said commission is entrusted with finding ways to settle the armed conflict in Shida Kartli by political means. There emerged real prospects for strengthening the sovereignty of the Republic of Georgia in this region and for preserving the national and cultural autonomy of the Ossetian population residing in it.

Proceeding from the above, the steps taken by Ossetian separatists cannot be regarded other than as provocation. Their goal is not only to interfere with the political process that is under way but also to practically sabotage this initiative and to oppose the jurisdiction of the Republic of Georgia in the given region to that of the RSFSR.

We cannot help drawing your attention to the fact that the aforementioned session was held under the chairmanship of A. Chekhoyev, USSR people's deputy from the former South Ossetian Autonomous Region. Apart from the fact that A. Chekhoyev is the former first secretary of the South Ossetian oblast committee of the Georgian Communist Party and was dismissed from this

post by the Ossetian population itself for abusing his official position, he had no right whatever to be at the head of the Ossetian extremists' new provocation, because he was well aware of what has been discussed at the session of the Council of Nationalities and on what the deputies had agreed.

In this connection, the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Republic of Georgia, by its resolution of 7 May 1991, declared the attempt to revive the oblast Soviet of People's Deputies of the so-called South Ossetian Autonomous Region as juridically invalid.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia appeals to you to take urgent measures, to show official support for the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet Presidium resolution, and to condemn the destructive act carried out by the Ossetian extremists; otherwise, the work of the legislative commission and the prospect for settling the conflict peacefully will become questionable.

We are convinced that Ossetian extremists will not succeed in sabotaging the settlement of the conflict in Shida Kartli by political means.

[signed] Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia; Zviad Gamsakhurdia, president of the Republic of Georgia.

7 May 1991, Tbilisi.

Fourteen Injured in South Ossetia Shooting

LD1605150891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1348 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] According to information from the North Ossetian Ministry of Internal Affairs, there was shooting again yesterday in the outskirts of Tskhinvali. Armed formations are continuing to fire on Ossetian villages in Tskhinvalskiy, (Naurskiy), and Leningorskiy Rayons. Fourteen peaceful citizens were seriously injured.

According to a Georgian Government decision, the emergency situation has been extended in Tskhinvali and Dzhavskiy Rayon for another month.

Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan, KGB's Kryuchkov Meet

LD1605215391 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2003 GMT 16 May 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast, presented by Yuriy Rostov]

[Text] Armenian Supreme Soviet Chairman Ter-Petrosyan, held a news conference in Yerevan today, at which he reported a telephone call during the night with USSR KGB Chairman Kryuchkov. According to Ter-Petrosyan, Kryuchkov admitted that Armenians are being harshly dealt with in Azerbaijan and in the areas of Armenia bordering on Azerbaijan. Kryuchkov told Ter-Petrosyan that authority over the area under a state of emergency will be transferred to Commandant Zhukov, and that the Azerbaijan Special Purpose Militia Detachment will be removed from participation in any operations.

The Armenian legislature was to meet in extraordinary session today in connection with the critical situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

'Democratic Russia' on Ending Force in Armenia

OW1605134591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 15 May 91

[Text] The coordinating council of the "Democratic Russia" movement has condemned the use of military force against Armenian militia and defenceless civilians and demanded that military actions in connection with the so-called disarmament in Armenia and Azerbaijan be suspended at once.

The coordinating council published a statement describing military actions launched by the Soviet army, Interior Ministry troops and Azeri special police units as an undeclared war against Armenia which embarked on the path of independence. The statement qualifies raids on the Armenian-populated villages of Getashen and Martunashen located in Azerbaijan as an act of genocide which led to the deportation of their inhabitans. According to the statement, the military launched terror on the pretext of combating Armenian militants who were neutralized as a phenomenon last autumn. "Democratic Russia" said it fears that the slaughter of Armenian policemen in the area of the conflict, particularly the killing of 14 policemen outside the village of Voskepar, will inevitably induce the population to take up arms. This is fraught with turning Armenia into another Afghanistan, provoking an upsurge of anti-Russian sentiments and jeopardizing the security of all Russians in Armenian territory.

The movement's coordinating council demands that military operations aimed at accomplishing disarmament be suspended. It calls for withdrawing 4th army units from the area of the conflict, for replacing them by USSR Interior Ministry troops, for inviting U.N. military observers, for conducting investigations into all facts of genocide and military terror, and for bringing those responsible for them, up to the Soviet President, to justice.

Armenian Premier on Turning From Brink of Abyss

NC1505181891 Yerevan Radio Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 14 May 91

[Text] The press has published the televised interview with Armenian Prime Minister Vazgen Manukyan on 11 May. He said that the situation is relatively calm in the border regions; there are no shootings, and it is calm in Nagorno-Karabakh and Shaumyanovskiy Rayon. However, have the armed operations stopped? It is difficult to answer this question. There is every indication that these operations have stopped, but there is one cause for

concern: Army subunits have been introduced into Yerevan. Until they are pulled out we cannot state for sure that the military operations have come to an end.

Referring to last week's events Vazgen Manukyan noted: It began with the evacuation of Getashen. He then stressed that our people closely escaped two dangers. It was possible that a section of the population, fearing a joint Soviet Army and Azerbaijani Special Purpose Militia attack, could have called for enslavement and given up its national program and freedom.

It was also possible that our people might have thrown caution to the winds. Moved by emotion, they could have declared a total war against the army. A struggle with a strong antagonist would have again pushed our people to the abyss. During these days our people demonstrated both heroism and prudence. It was not possible to push our people into one of these two abysses. It was also not possible to prove that there are ostensibly guerrillas in the border regions who are in constant struggle and war with Azerbaijan. It is very sad that our compatriots were martyred and taken prisoner.

Lukyanov Describes Situation in Nagorno-Karabakh

LD1605144791 Moscow TASS in English 1329 GMT 16 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—Soviet parliament chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov described as "very difficult" talks which he conducted for two days now with Armenian Supreme Soviet Chairman Levon Ter-Petrosyan, President of Azerbaijan Ayaz Mutalibov and military leaders.

Lukyanov said that the Armenian parliament leader "asked only for one thing: that control over all actions to disarm militants on the territory of Nagorno-Karabakh be given to the commanding officer of the troops, deployed in the area under state of emergency."

"This has been fulfilled. As by morning today all actions have been taken only under authority of the USSR Interior Ministry," Lukyanov said. He said that a large quantity of automatic weapons, pistols, grenades, 30 kilogrammes of explosives and five radio stations had been confiscated during the operations to disarm militants.

The Army and USSR Interior Ministry troops "are taking efforts so that civilians do not suffer in the disarming operation," Lukyanov said.

Nagorno-Karabakh Appeals for UN Assistance

LD1505214691 Moscow TASS in English 1655 GMT 15 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin—TASS "kills" this item at 1833 GMT on 15 May]

[Text] Stepanakert May 15 TASS—The executive committee of Nagorno-Karabakh governing council appealed to the United Nations and parliaments throughout the world to save Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh from genocide and to grant political asylum.

Nagorno-Karabakh Armenians were forced to take this extreme measure after events of the past three years.

In the past twenty-four hours Army units and Azerbaijani militiamen carried out operations across the region to check identity and confiscate weapons. They detained more than 200 people in the Armenian villages of the region and Stepanakert. According to preliminary data, 13 members of local militia were among the detained. Government-issue arms were confiscated from them.

A TASS correspondent visited the village Dashbulag in Askeran region, where an operation was held early today. He discovered traces of destruction. Destroyed buildings include a school, a hospital and the local council.

The population has yet to express its attitude to the decision of the executive council.

NKAO Leaders Appeal to UN, World Legislatures

OW1605100691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 15 May 91

[Text] The Armenian leadership of Nagorno-Karabakh [NKAO] has appealed to the United Nations and parliaments all over the world to protect the Karabakh people against genocide, and grant them political asylum and a chance to leave the Soviet Union with their movable property in compliance with the existing international norms. The appeal, which is signed by the Executive Committee of the Soviet of People's Deputies of the Autonomous Region of Nagorno- Karabakh, says that the Armenian population of the region is subject to "moral, economic, political and physical pressure authorized by the USSR and Azerbaijani leaderships and going as far as open violence and humiliation." The document mentions "repeated statements by the leader of the Azerbaijani Republic about the need to deport all Armenians from Nagorno-Karabakh", which shows that "the national government may be interested in having the situation develop further along this line so that Armenia be pressured into staying within the USSR."

The authors of the appeal draw the conclusion that Nagorno- Karabakh's Armenian population is facing the threat of total physical extermination.

Mounting Tensions in Nagorno-Karabakh Cited

OW1605103691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 15 May 91

[Text] The situation in Nagorno-Karabakh is characterized by rising tensions. Passport control checks have spread virtually over the whole territory of the autonomous region. The interior department of Mardakert district reports that Azerbaijani special police units,

OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment], have entered into five villages, confiscating valuable belongings during serarches. Several policemen have been disarmed and two policemen have been captured among other people and sent in the direction of Mir-Bashir in the neighbouring district of Azerbaijan.

Over 30 people, mainly men, have been captured the same way in a village of Askeran district. Reports indicate that this situation is common to all areas of Nagorno-Karabakh. The Armenians complain of arbitrary harassment and describe these passport control checks as a prelude to a deportation.

In Arakiul village of Gudraut district, forms for those who wish to leave for Armenia signed by Victor Polianichko, the second secretary of the Azerbaijani Communist Party and the chairman of the republican committee on Nagorno-Karabakh, have been distributed among local residents who only need to put their signatures on them.

In Stepanakert the population is uneasy about night-time arrests which were reportedly carried out by plain-clothed people accompanied by the Russian military without any warrants but according to some lists. Preliminary reports indicate that those arrested were transported in the direction of Agdam.

In Agdam, as well as in Jebrail, Fizuli, Mir-Bashir and Shusha districts of Azerbaijan a kind of filtration camps under the jurisdiction of the interior ministries of the USSR and Azerbaijan have been set up for Armenian detainees.

Unconfirmed reports indicate that the operation in Nagorno-Karabakh has been carried out with Moscow's consent with the view to wiping out hitmen and confiscating weapons. A troika of high-ranking officers of the Soviet defense and interior ministries and the KGB have arrived in Nagorno-Karabakh and now act independently from corresponding regional institutions.

Presently the regional leaders have been discussing the situation, in particular the question of whether to appeal to world public opinon to grant political asylum to all the Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Troop Massing, Hostage Taking Reported in NKAO

NC1505175991 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 14 May 91

[Excerpts] Stepanakert, 14 May (ARMENPRES)—The brief occupation of the editorial office of KHORHRDAYIN KARABAKH (SOVETSKIY KARABAKH) on the night of 11 May by armed men wearing troop uniforms and carrying automatic weapons was the precursor of incidents that threaten Nagorno-Karabakh. [passage omitted]

The troop concentration in Nagorno-Karabakh has increased substantially since then. The killing of innocent people, hostage taking, firing on buildings, theft of animals, and other crimes continue. A massive operation to control passports is possible. What method will the controllers use? Will they decide on the method used in Getashen, Martunashen, and Gadrutskiy Rayon, or the one provided by the law? Only time will tell.

On 13 May Stepanakert's telephone link with Mardakertskiy and Gadrutskiy Rayons, Berdadzor subrayon, and Yerevan was severed.

According to the press center of the oblast soviet executive committee, on 12 May the subunits of the Internal Troops and the Azerbaijani Special Purpose Militia raided the Armenian villages of Aragyul and Dolanlur in Gadrutskiy Rayon and took the men in trucks to the Azerbaijani settlement of Dzhabrail. Some time later, some of them were released and the rest were kept as hostages.

[Yerevan Radio Yerevan Network in Armenian at 1730 GMT on 14 May reports that the passport control in Gadrutskiy Rayon "has been turned into a way to terrorize the local population. Peaceful citizens are being pillaged and their national pride is being trampled upon." Two villages are virtually depopulated, and the fate of some hostages is unknown. "The residents of a number of villages have been given the ultimatum to leave their houses within three days." The report ends by saying that "Getashen's fate might also fall on Nagorno-Karabakh."]

Central Asia

Niyazov on Union Treaty, Turkmen Economy

PM1605122191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[Interview with Turkmenistan President S.A. Niyazov by correspondent V. Kuleshov; place and date not given: "Cast Off the Constraints Without Tearing Out the Roots"]

[Text] [Kuleshov] In your view, Saparmurad Atayevich, is the joint statement by the USSR president and the leaders of the nine republics a real step toward the signing of the Union treaty?

[Niyazov] Certainly. The Union—a federation which we intend to join and for whose sake the Union treaty will be signed—must be based on the genuine autonomy of republics exercising full rights. In other words, we decide by ourselves what powers should be handed over to the center, we form the Union organs, instead of the other way around. What we need in particular now is unity of actions in the elaboration of joint approaches and the coordination of efforts along the main avenues in the anti-crisis program's implementation. Who should be the main coordinator here? The USSR president. It is he, and no one else who should exercise his powers to coordinate the actions by all republics in stabilizing the situation.

[Kuleshov] You advocate genuine autonomy for the republics and, at the same time, unity and integrity of the Union, the federation. Are you not contradicting yourself here?

[Niyazov] Maybe. In my view, however, this contradiction is normal. I see prospects for the development of the entire Soviet Union in the strengthening and improvement of mutual relations between the country's nations and peoples, in the ensuring of peace and tranquility in our home. I have never questioned the Soviet Union's continued existence. We all—the nations and ethnic groups whose roots are intertwined—are clearly aware: Not a single republic can manage without the Union today, no matter how potentially rich it may be. Those who are trying to veer off the main highway, who are tearing out roots and breaking ties in the hope that even after seceding from the Union they would be able to retain the full volume and terms of economic relations with other regions or switch to the world market, are being not only naive but also criminal toward their people. This will bring nothing but interethnic dissensions and hopeless despair to people involved in these artificially created "wars...."

[Kuleshov] I remember a letter written by one VECHERNYY ASHKHABAD [Evening Ashkhabad] reader: "I am visiting my daughter here and can assess life in the republic impartially, as it were. Here there is still some authority, a sense of responsibility felt by Turkmenia's leaders for their deeds and words..." It is true, Saparmurad Atayevich, Turkmenia really stands out like an oasis of tranquility against the background of destructive processes, the political storm raging in the country, and the interethnic collisions. No strikes, no rallies, no people's fronts....

[Niyazov] All despite perestroyka, is this what you mean? Is the absence of political clashes here because of the fact that the people are fed up and unable to comprehend the winds of change? You know, politics is fine, but it must not be forgotten that it focuses on man. In other words, should we abandon him to his fate and concentrate all our energy on bickering with our opponents?

The republic has been living in conditions of economic autonomy for a year now and has made gains it would not have even dreamed of in the recent past. We have experienced no serious opposition to our initiatives by the center. At the same time, we realize that it is impossible to dismantle overnight the rigidly centralized economic system. Turkmenia is one of the country's richest republics. There are vast mineral, raw material, and agricultural resources and the mighty potential of an industrious people and goed workers. But what do we actually have? A backward national economy, a single-track economy which inflicts identical damage to the interests of the Turkmen, Russian, and other peoples living in the republic.

In the West, questions of socioeconomic development are assigned to regions, laender, or states. In our country—to ministries and departments. They wield real power in the sectors, and this power extends only to growing volumes of raw material extraction which brings only pennies to the republic but is advantageous for the department. Department leaders have never been especially worried about social problems, cadre training, or the improvement of people's lives.... Now the situation is changing somewhat, but we are not happy with the pace of change. By signing the Union treaty and the documents mandatory for its execution, I hope that we will do away with the lack or reciprocal commitment and the indiscipline in deliveries, will establish properly defined horizontal economic ties, and will create conditions for productive work by each and every collective.

[Kuleshov] Advocating the Union's unity and remaining loyal to the principles of internationalism and brotherhood, Turkmenia is determining its own national image by boldly embarking on rapprochement with foreign countries. What has prompted such a high profile abroad? As a matter of fact, foreign partners are also showing extraordinary interest in the republic. Proof of this can be seen—without looking any further—in the recent traditional familiarization visit to Ashkhabad by the heads of diplomatic missions accredited in the USSR....

[Niyazov] Yes, we are relying mainly on cooperation with the West and countries in the East. The interest is actually reciprocal. Suffice it to recall the international congress in Houston, which announced a competition between the world's largest oil companies for the pursuit of prospecting work in the republic's territory. I could go on at some length about the establishment of direct ties between a number of Turkmenia's cities and China's provinces, the establishment of permanent business contacts and scientific cooperation between the republic's medical workers and Turkey's Ministry of Health, and the recently signed Treaty on Mutual Understanding between Turkmenistan's and Iran's Foreign Ministries.

Having enlarged our Foreign Ministry, we are conducting talks on setting up trade missions in more than 15 countries. The aim is mutually advantageous cooperation and the creation of joint enterprises. For example, a joint enterprise on export-import operations, recently registered in Hamburg, will help to consolidate the republic's export potential and will provide advertising for Turkmen carpets, traditional metal decorative products, and other folk craft products. Everything that is undertaken in the foreign economic sphere pursues the objective of the republic's development within the world community framework.

[Kuleshov] Many foreign visitors with whom I have an opportunity to talk have assured me: We are embarking on cooperation with Turkmenia because here you have order and stability—no political deluges, no interethnic enmity. Nonetheless, there are people who would like to demolish this tranquility and disrupt this order. It is well

known that special services in a series of foreign countries are implementing a program which includes subversive operations against Central Asian republics, and against Turkmenia in particular, using the "Islamic factor." What do you think, is a growth of nationalist moods in Turkmenia possible?

[Niyazov] Let me be frank: Nationalists in Turkmenia are even now trying to do something, but they lack support among the population. Charity and compassion for one's fellow-man, magnanimity and sympathy for the weak—these are inherent in Turkmen people's character and blood. A real Muslim, as a surah in the Koran says, will never start a fratricidal war... I, for example, was imbued with the spirit of brotherhood with other people since childhood.

I well recall the 1948 Ashkhabad earthquake. My mother and two brothers died. I was saved by a miracle... I was picked up by some Russian woman. She wrapped my up in some old clothes and took me to her cottage. A day later, having rested well, I went out in the street. Ashkhabad was in ruins, dead bodies lying beneath the rubble of houses. My relatives were dug out four days later... I spent six months living with different people, then ended up in a children's home with Ukrainians, Belorussians, Turkmens—and nobody bothered separating us along nationality lines. I remember the Russian teachers, so good at listening, understanding, providing support. I will never forget the sense of kinship and international brotherhood which I acquired in the children's home at that time. I will preserve it for ever. Surely I am not the only one to feel sorrow and anguish on hearing about everything that is happening today between Armenia and Azerbaijan, in Georgia, and around Tskhinvali.

[Kuleshov] What is the republic doing to guarantee minimum living standards for its inhabitants?

[Niyazov] We are preparing for the market, but we are in no hurry. We will not create artificial conditions for the privatization and destatization of property. This is a complex process and we are not yet ready for it. We will, of course, adopt laws on privatization but, in all probability, they will not come into effect immediately. In industry and the construction industry, for example, we find leasing more suitable. For the time being, we will not be selling land into private hands. Regarding the social protection of the republic's population, I perceive it as primarily taking the form of consistently raising wages. In the very near future we will be raising the wages of workers in culture, health care, and national education. The main point today is to maintain the new trends in the life of the republic and the country, to strengthen the Union and unity without which our present and future are unimaginable.

Tajik President on Joint Statement, Union Treaty

PM1605152591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 May 91 First Edition pp 1, 2

[Interview with Tajik President Kakhar Makhkamov by correspondent Colonel A. Ladin under the rubric "Union Treaty: View From the Republics;" date and place not given: "Tajik SSR President Kakhar Makhkamov: The People's Choice"]

[Text] [Ladin] Esteemed Kakhar Makhkamovich, keen discussion of the joint statement adopted by the USSR president and the top leaders of nine republics on urgent measures to stabilize the situation in the country and overcome the crisis is still under way in the country and abroad. The opinions are sometimes diametrically opposed. Doubts are being voiced regarding the full implementation of all five points of the document, which you, too, signed. What is your opinion of the joint "Statement of the 10"?

[Makhkamov] Let me tell you frankly: I personally did not expect everyone to like the highly important step toward stabilizing the situation in the country taken as a result of concerted efforts by the USSR president and the leaders of the nine republics. It is no secret, after all, that some political forces are overtly striving to do their utmost to support manifestations of instability in the country, considering it a success for themselves if they succeed in rocking our ship of state a little more severely. You may ask why they want to do this: to have weightier arguments to use against the country's president. Look, everything is going badly, they say. It is time to change our leadership. Whom do they see as a replacement? The same people who are today presenting various slogans and schemes, creating in many instances a semblance of concern for their native land while in fact dreaming more about power. Incidentally, rarely realizing whether all the parties and movements that have emerged of late are ready to assume powers of authority and able to set the correct course for the ship of state.

On the other hand, some people have become practiced in discrediting any steps that the country's leadership takes to extricate our society from the state of crisis. They rarely present more effective possible solutions of their own. Yet the value of any opposition lies in the fact that it has its own opinion, its own options and approaches. Undiluted criticism is an unproductive occupation.

[Ladin] However, the "Statement of the 10" itself is also being subjected to criticism—and extremely stormy criticism at that....

[Makhkamov] Yes, some people today do nothing but assiduously seek weak spots in both the joint statement and the government anticrisis program. For instance: Why is it worded this way rather than that? On the radio I hear some staff and nonstaff commentators expressing discontent over the fifth point of the document we adopted. You will remember it says that the leaders of

the Union and the republics regard as intolerable any attempts to secure political ends by inciting people to civil disobedience, strikes, and appeals to overthrow existing legally elected organs of state power. I think that this tenet is particularly timely today and I am quite satisfied with the fact that we nine leaders succeeded in reaching a unanimous opinion on this acute question with the country's president. Any other approach is simply inconceivable in the prevailing situation. I think the people will grasp what those who are inciting the masses to destructive actions want.

In signing the joint statement, which, incidentally, by no means had an easy conception, I felt a thrilling sense of the emergent unity of millions of people in our country who have made their choice in favor of the new Union of sovereign states. We have had enough of these futile debates about how we are to live: together or apart. We have argued for a long time and life shows that no republic can cope with the accumulated problems alone. Why set up lofty barriers on the borders between republics when the whole world wants cooperation, openness, and mutual trust. We have no other choice—apart from mutual respect, mutual assistance, and firm pooling of efforts in the economy. That is the road on which we must seek accord.

[Ladin] Our readers' comments indicate that very many people today want the period between the signing of the joint statement and the adoption of the new Union treaty to be as short as possible. Might it be possible to formalize our state in its renewed form as early as this year?

[Makhkamov] I firmly believe that. By signing the joint statement, both the USSR president and the republic leaders assumed the responsibility of guaranteeing the execution of all its provisions. At present I have no reason to doubt that the finalization of the draft new Union treaty will be completed within the agreed time frame and it will be signed. Our republic is doing everything to speed up this process. It is important for us to ensure that all slipups in forming the budget and distributing the requisite funds among the republics are rapidly eliminated. As is well known, our republic still supplies raw materials for various industrial sectors in the country. Only 11 percent of the cotton grown in the republic is made into fabric and yarn by our own processing production units. The rest is sent to other regions of the country. We are entitled to demand that some of the revenue from the goods produced with our cotton comes back to Tajikistan, but today the situation is literally critical.

Today we have horizontal ties with all republics. At the moment, however, contractual relations are characterized by instability, and transport often lets us down. That is, enterprises have the requisite output for us, but how are they to deliver it? Aluminum oxide shipped in from abroad is lying in Batumi. Meanwhile, the Tursunzadevskiy aluminum plant is in turmoil because of the shortage of this raw material.

It is the same story for many products. The new Union treaty, on which I pin great hopes, should help establish strict delivery discipline and restore order in the economy.

Any delay will put our republic in an exceptionally complex position. A quite considerable proportion of our republic's population is without social protection. More than half are children under the age of 18 years. There are many women not employed in production, mothers of large families, and also invalids and pensioners. Given the unchecked rise in prices and shortage of everyday goods, our fellow citizens who are badly in need of assistance must not be left without it. They must be helped out in a timely manner without waiting for this issue to be settled at Union Government level.

[Ladin] I know that the republic has taken some steps to ease the social tension brought about by the rise in prices.

[Makhkamov] In the March-April period the Tajik SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Cabinet of Ministers lifted the 5-percent sales tax on a sizable group of socially significant goods. Retail prices of flour, bread, and bakery products have been reduced and a tax-exempt monetary grant of 50 rubles [R] per month has been established for nonworking mothers of large families with five or more children under the age of majority. Unfortunately, no provision was made for this measure at Union level.

In April retail prices for children's goods were reduced. To stimulate the production of children's goods enterprises and organizations manufacturing these goods have been exempted from profits tax, and R30 monthly from the republic's budget has been added to the compensation of up to R60 for students at higher and secondary specialized educational establishments.

All this has to some extent eased the lives of low-income strata of the population. But the republic will not be able to cover all these benefits from its own internal potential alone. Fixed budgetary revenue from the center is needed. We have not received a refusal, but I do not know when the required funds will arrive. I very much hope that the joint statement's signatories will be quick to fulfill their commitments and that the Union Government will be able to fully implement all the joint document's provisions. Our problem is that vertical structures were destroyed with undue haste. People thought that they would thus be able to escape central diktat more quickly. In fact, it transpired that, figuratively speaking, the baby was also thrown out with the bath water. Coordinating mechanisms linking the economy together were also lost at the same time. In my view, the joint statement provides a good chance of reviving in a new capacity at least part of the vertical management system. Let us see what comes of it....

[Ladin] Yet at first glance horizontal ties are becoming the priority. The rights of a sovereign state—

republic—whose form has been recognized make it possible to have extensive autonomy, including enlisting foreign capital and experience to combat the crisis....

[Makhkamov] In my view, the development of horizontal ties characterizes the new situation that the reform of economic relations has already given us. Accommodating initiative from below, the center is gradually handing over to the republics functions previously kept under its control. That is a normal process. I will go further: In the future sovereign states—the subjects of the new Union—will increasingly actively combine their material and financial potential to develop the economy and saturate the consumer market with the requisite goods. Now you by no means have to get Moscow's blessing to do this. Our republic very much hopes that it will prove possible in the near future, by recruiting the country's major industrial centers, to build enterprises in our republic to produce semimanufactures and sewn goods for the common market from Tajik cotton. Efforts can also be pooled to produce valuable foodstuffs. Our land of plenty cultivated by hard-working peasants is capable of producing rich harvests. Once again, adequate capacities are needed to store and convert the harvest into valuable food products. The desired result can be achieved quicker through cooperation.

I think that the republic or region that operates with greater enterprise and compels all forms of the market system of economic activity to work for the end result will now take the lead in overcoming the crisis. It is important not to wait for someone to come along to teach and lead you. We must learn and act at the same time today. We must rouse people's initiative and foster a taste for autonomous, free, entrepreneurial activity. A presidential decree in the republic proclaimed the start of work to destatize and privatize ownership. I am sure that the gradual elimination of the absolute state monopoly on production—primarily consumer goods—will create healthy competition and increase the influx of higher-quality goods into the trade network. In time it will also reduce prices. So Tajikistan is not demanding any special privileges for itself in implementing the anticrisis program.

We are beginning to implement a joint venture with a group of U.S., Canadian, Hong Kong, and Israeli companies to cultivate and process raw cotton using more progressive technology within the republic.

[Ladin] Will that not reduce shipments of cotton to Union stocks?

[Makhkamov] Tajikistan holds an unequivocal stance as regards its commitments—its commitments to its country will continue to be met. We are not renouncing cooperation or integration and we believe that they should continue to deepen and develop and constitute a reliable system.

[Ladin] Can we expect Tajikistan to be as principled and steadfast regarding its defense commitments, of which there is no mention in the joint statement? Perhaps the USSR president and the leaders of the nine sovereign states thought there are no particular problems here?

[Makhkamov] The joint statement did not in fact touch on questions of defense. They were perhaps not singled out only because, for all the difficulties, the Armed Forces are staunchly coping with their commitments, manifesting true military presence of mind, discipline, and awareness. As far as I know, there are more than enough defense problems. I am sure that the full implementation of the joint statement will also have a positive impact on Army and Navy affairs. That is why we feel that the Armed Forces, like the overwhelming mass of the population, greeted the step toward joint actions between the USSR president and the top leaders of nine republics with approval and hope of better things.

Allow me to conclude our conversation by expressing my firm conviction that we will achieve our objectives and create a renewed Union state that will hold a position of prestige in the world community not because of its military might but on the basis of the principles of openness, justice, and respect for panhuman values.

New Kyrgyz Party Leader Supports Gorbachev

OW1605123291 Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1900 GMT 11 May 91

[Interview with Dzhumgalbek Amanbayev, new Kyrgyz Communist Party First Secretary by V. Fedorov; place and date not given; from the "Utro 120 + 30" program—recorded]

[Text] [Fedorov] Now for the main event [in Bishkek]. There has been a complete change in leadership in the communist party of Kyrgystan. The position of first secretary has been filled by Dzhumgalbek Amanbayev. He replaced Absamat Masaliyev who moved to the CPSU Central Committee. It is expected that this will stabilize the political situation, insofar as the position of the former party leader was mentioned by the opposition to the president. [video then cuts to show interview with Amanbayev]

[Amanbayev] The newly elected secretariat has taken a path toward supporting our democratically elected president in the first place, and state power and state structures in general.

[Fedorov] Your predecessor was known for not being very sympathetic toward glasnost, and dissent in particular. Will there be changes in this area?

[Amanbayev] Yes, most assuredly there will be.

[Fedorov] What will be your attitude to dissent, different parties, and other movements that do not agree, say, with Marxism?

[Amanbayev] It will be calm, because we have taken a path of cooperating with them, of conducting a dialogue.

On questions of principle we will be guided by our socialist choice, our communist ideals, and here we will speak with them frankly and in a principled way.

[Fedorov] One of the secretaries of the new Central Committee writing in the local press said that Gorbachev had not become a serious politician. Is this your opinion, too? [Video shows a newspaper page with the rubric "Interlocutor" at the top and a full page article by Vladimir Artemov: "Mikhail Sergeyevich Did Not Turn Into a Serious Politician"]

[Amanbayev] I am of a completely different opinion. It is difficult at present for Mikhail Sergeyevich. The country is in the midst of a historic period. Revolutionary processes are at work and our people must endure them. I consider that the responsibility that Mikhail Sergeyevich has undertaken with perestroyka, with democratization, and with changes in political and economic structures, is a very courageous thing. I support Mikhail Sergeyvich in his endeavors.

Tajik Law on Denationalization

914A0565A

For this law published in the 6 March 1991 KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-018, dated 15 April 1991, pages 16-18.

Uzbek Draft Legislation on Enterprises

914A0514A

For this legislation published in the 29 January 1991 PRAVDA VOSTOKA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-019, dated 19 April 1991, pages 10-17.

Uzbek Law on Banks, Banking Activities

914A0617A

For this law published in the 5 March 1991 PRAVDA VOSTOKA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-020, dated 25 April 1991, pages 25-34.

Uzbek Law on Income Tax

914A0614A

For this law published in the 7 March 1991 PRAVDA VOSTOKA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-020, dated 25 April 1991, pages 34-44.

Kazakh Law on Employment of Population

914A0574A

For this law published in the 8 February 1991 KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-019, dated 19 April 1991, pages 17-27.

Kyrgyz Illegal Trade Activities Amendments

914A0610A

For this law amending legislation on illegal trade activities published in the 6 March 1991 SLOVO KYRGYZSTANA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-019, dated 19 April 1991, pages 34-37.